

REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS

VOLUME I

JANUARY 15, 1942

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

GREETINGS FROM THE BISHOP OF LEAVENWORTH The Most Reverend Paul C. Schulte, D.D.	4
PLANS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS—The Editors	6
RELIGIOUS CONSECRATION—Matthew Germing, S.J.	8
JOHN NEPOMUCENE NEUMANN	14
THE VOW OF POVERTY IN THE CODE OF CANON LAW Adam C. Ellis, S.J.	15
THE EDUCATION OF SISTERS—William J. McGucken, S.J.	27
HYGIENIC MORTIFICATION—G. Augustine Ellard, S.J.	32
EXEMPTIONS FROM FASTING—Gerald Kelly, S.J.	42
SAINT ROBERT BELLARMINE'S <i>SIGN OF THE CROSS</i> Clement DeMuth, S.J.	47
LITURGY IN THE PATTERN OF MODERN PRAYING Gerald Ellard, S.J.	51
BOOK REVIEWS	
THE MASS. By the Reverend Joseph A. Dunney	63
A CATHOLIC DICTIONARY. Edited by Donald Attwater	63
ALL THE DAY LONG. By Daniel Sargent	64
"FEAR NOT, LITTLE FLOCK." By the Reverend George Zimpfer	65
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	
1. Period of Recollection before Perpetual Vows	68
2. Shortening the Second Year of Novitiate	68
3. Permission of Parents for Emergency Operation	69
4. Recital of Little Office by those absent from Community Recitation	69
5. Private Vows by Professed Religious	70
6. Curtain between Priest and Penitent in Convent Confessional	70
DECISIONS OF THE HOLY SEE OF INTEREST TO RELIGIOUS	71

REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS, January, 1942. Vol. I, No. 1. Published bi-monthly: January, March, May, July, September, and November, at The College Press, 606 Harrison Street, Topeka, Kansas, by St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas, with ecclesiastical approbation. Application for second class entry pending.

Editorial Board: Adam C. Ellis, S.J., G. Augustine Ellard, S.J., Gerald Kelly, S.J.

Copyright, 1942, by Adam C. Ellis. Permission is hereby granted for quotations of reasonable length, provided due credit be given this review and the author.

Subscription price: 2 dollars a year.

Printed in U. S. A.

Greetings from the Bishop of Leavenworth

WE ARE reminded of the striking analogy that exists between the Mystical Body of Christ and our own physical body. As the human body is made up of millions of tiny cells, each cell in a sense a distinct entity having its own function, so too, the Church is made up of millions of individual members, living individual lives; yet, even as each cell in our body draws life from the soul, so also is each member of the Mystical Body of Christ quickened by the spiritual life of Sanctifying Grace.

Carrying the analogy further, we are reminded that, as the tiny individual cells are grouped so as to form individual organs and members of our body, so too, in the Mystical Body of Christ, individual men and women are often grouped into societies and organizations, distinct, yet working for the common good and drawing life and inspiration from the one spiritual head. As St. Paul reminds us, "the eye cannot say to the hand: I need not thy help; nor again the head to the feet: I have no need of you," neither can the various groups within the Church be self-centered, but they must work for the common good of the whole Church under the guidance of its head, Christ's Vicar on earth.

The religious form what might be called the right arm of the Mystical Body of Christ. Ever since our Divine Savior gave the invitation to the young man in the Gospel, "if thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast, and give to the poor and come, follow me," noble souls have been inspired to leave all things and seek perfection in the

life of the religious. The very earliest centuries of the Church already found the deserts filled with the cells of the anchorites, from which soon was to be born the great monastic system as we have it today.

Naturally, the unusual form of life led by the religious presents for them unusual problems. The Church in her canon law has taken cognizance of this and has devoted much space to defining the rights and duties of religious, both as individuals and as institutions. However, the ramifications of these rights and duties are so far reaching and the field of direction towards spiritual perfection is so vast that the volumes upon volumes of commentaries that have been written have not begun to exhaust the subjects. Besides, new problems are ever arising.

We have today many reviews of a general ecclesiastical character dealing with the multitudinous phases of the Church in general, yet we can readily see the need of a special review for the religious, not only to explain the general laws governing their lives, but also to keep them abreast of the problems that the ever-changing world is presenting to them. We feel confident therefore that REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS, which is making its bow with this issue, will be not only very helpful to the religious but welcomed by the entire Church. We are happy to give it our personal approbation and feel honored that it is to be published in our Diocese. We are confident of its success under the editorial guidance of the Jesuit Fathers of St. Mary's. May it live long and effect much "pro Deo et Ecclesia!"

✠ PAUL C. SCHULTE,
Bishop of Leavenworth.

Plans and Acknowledgements

IN THIS initial number of REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS we wish to say something of our purpose and our plans, so that our readers may know rather definitely what to expect of us.

Our review is for all religious, clerical and non-clerical. However, we shall consider primarily the needs of brothers and nuns, because clerics, particularly those in sacred orders, already have many excellent reviews at their disposal. This policy need not make the review less interesting to clerics, and it should increase its utility for those who may be entrusted with the spiritual guidance of other religious. In this latter connection, the review may also be of service to diocesan priests, as many of them are confessors and spiritual directors of religious.

We have founded this magazine for a two-fold purpose: first, to aid religious in their personal sanctification; and secondly, to be of some service to them in carrying on their respective apostolic works. The first purpose evidently calls for articles of a purely ascetical nature; also for solid articles on the doctrines, legislation, and liturgy of the Church, as all true piety must ultimately conform to the Church's doctrine and practice. In line with the second purpose will be articles which may have no direct bearing on the personal lives of the religious themselves, such as background articles on various sections of the catechism, suggestions for the care of the sick and the dying and for the carrying on of other ministries.

Our general policy will be to offer articles of interest to all, but this policy cannot be inflexible. Some topics will be of use to superiors and of slight value to subjects;

some will be especially for brothers, others for nuns; some may concern only those engaged in a definite work such as teaching, caring for the sick, and so forth. We think it well to adopt no general policy that would exclude such specialized articles; otherwise our power for good would be greatly diminished.

We anticipate difficulties. The war situation evidently increases the difficulty of making definite plans. Some of our articles will be quite theological in content, yet these must be written in a non-technical, and understandable manner—an accomplishment that is not easy. On the part of our subscribers, some superiors have already suggested to us that a huge difficulty will be to find time for reading the review. We realize the force of this practical objection; yet we hope that a fair number of individuals will find the time for private reading, and we suggest that some articles from each issue will be suitable for community reading.

The launching of this project is the result of extensive dreaming and planning. Indeed, we should have begun many years ago, had not a certain unforeseen event delayed our plans. Today, as we finally go to press, we are moved with an intense spirit of gratitude, to God for His assistance, and to all others who have helped us. Almost universally we have met with encouragement and cooperation. Our Bishop has been most kind in approving our venture; our own and other religious superiors were constantly helpful. Higher superiors, in general, responded very promptly and generously to our request for lists of houses to circularize; in many instances the superiors themselves sent subscriptions for entire congregations or provinces, thus saving us considerable labor and expense. May God bless them all, and may He prosper this work begun for His greater glory!

—THE EDITORS.

Religious Consecration

Matthew Germing, S.J.

HOLY SCRIPTURE says: "He that contemneth small things shall fall by little and little" (Ecclesiasticus 19:1). Spiritual writers commenting on these words rightly insist on the importance of little things in the spiritual life. In the present consideration I wish to call attention, primarily, not to little things but to a big truth. I say, "primarily," because I believe that often enough interest in little things is best promoted by insistence on some large fundamental truth or fact on which the little things depend. Such a truth, once it has been thoroughly understood and assimilated, once it has permeated the very marrow of our being and is thereafter kept vigorously alive in mind and heart, will be a wonderfully energizing force in the daily routine of life. It will extend its influence to the smallest actions of the day and thus compel us to take heed of even the little things.

Of this character is the consecration to God made by the members of every religious order and congregation. We are familiar in a general way with the meaning of consecration. Persons or things are consecrated when they are set apart and with the proper ceremonies dedicated to God or the service of God. Thus the chalice used by the priest at Mass is consecrated; it is sacred and may not be used for any other purpose. To use it for other purposes would be sinful and sacrilegious. The same holds of a consecrated church.

All religious are consecrated to God by means of the three vows of religion. They are sacred in the eyes of God, far more sacred than consecrated church or chalice. Whether they belong to an active or a contemplative order, whether they are engaged in school work or hospital duties, whether in charge of orphans or caring for the aged and infirm, no matter what their function or task or position in the community, all are consecrated to God. And they are so consecrated by their three vows.

There is a twofold aspect to these vows, the negative and the positive. The negative aspect is the privation involved in the vows, but privation is not the distinctive

feature of religious poverty, chastity, and obedience. The mere lack of temporal goods does not make anyone acceptable or sacred in God's sight. Poverty as such makes many people in the world at large discontented and miserable, leading to complaints and rebellion against Providence. Nor does celibacy with its privations have of itself a sanctifying effect. And as for obedience, a man may be a slave and be far from Christian and evangelical obedience. It is the motive that counts. It is the love of Christ, the consecration to God which is the purpose and end of all these sacrifices and privations, that makes them precious in the sight of heaven. And this is the positive aspect of the vows of religion.

When we pronounced our vows for the first time we offered to God, to Christ our King and to His Sacred Heart all we had or possessed, and made ourselves entirely dependent on God and His representatives on earth. When St. Francis of Assisi bade farewell to his father and gave away the very clothes he wore, he said: "Now I can truly say, our Father who art in heaven." Certainly Francis knew that God was his Father before that time, but he meant to say that only now was he absolutely without all earthly support whatever; he had only his Father in heaven to rely upon. And this gave him perfect joy and perfect confidence. Blessed are we if our renunciation of the things of earth was nearly as complete as that of St. Francis and made in the same joyous spirit. Then we can exclaim with him in transports of seraphic love, "My God and my all!" and pray to God in the word of another saint, "Give me only Thy love and Thy grace and I am rich enough and desire nothing more."

But in pronouncing our vows we did much more than despoil ourselves of all temporal possessions out of love for Christ our Lord. We offered ourselves. There is recorded for us in Holy Scripture (I Paralipomenon 29: 16, 17) the touching prayer of King David when, surrounded by a vast multitude of his people, he offered to Almighty God the gold and silver and precious stones he had gathered from far and near for the temple which his son Solomon was to build. And David prayed: "O Lord our God, all this store that we have prepared to build thee a house for thy holy name is from thy hand, and all things are thine. I know, my God, that thou provest hearts and lovest simplicity,

wherefore I also in the simplicity of my heart have joyfully offered all these things." We also on the day of our vows made our offerings to God in joyful spirit, presenting not gold or silver or precious stones but gifts far more precious in the sight of heaven—the loyalty and devotion of a consecrated soul. We knelt before the altar and in simplicity and sincerity of heart pronounced the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Thus we made an oblation to God of our entire being, our body with its senses and all their pleasures, our soul with its intellect and free will, promising to understand and do all things in accordance with the rules and constitutions of the religious life we then and there embraced in all its fulness. And we made these promises solemnly before the throne of God, in the presence of Mary, Queen of heaven, of our Guardian Angel, our patron saints and the whole heavenly court as witnesses of our oblation. With holy David we acknowledged to God, "All things are thine, and we have given thee what we received of thy hand." Thus we vowed eternal loyalty to Christ and became consecrated and sacred in His eyes.

This consecration was the most important event in our life, a spiritual fact of tremendous import. For it meant the abandonment of all selfish interests and complete devotion to the cause of Christ. Up to that time self had chiefly been the focus of our thoughts and desires; now our Lord and Savior was to be enthroned in our mind and heart. Our aims in life, our thinking and planning, our capabilities of soul and body, our work and recreation, our time itself, all were consecrated and must be directed to God. We are entirely His.

We ought to make it our serious effort to understand and appreciate this fact. We should do what the Blessed Virgin did during her life on earth. And what did she do? St. Luke tells us in the second chapter of his Gospel. Toward the end of his account of the nativity of our Lord, after narrating the apparition of the angel to the shepherds and the visit of the latter to Bethlehem, he adds: "But Mary kept in mind all these words, pondering them in her heart." We may be sure that what is told us so explicitly of her conduct in the present instance she did on many other occasions in connection with the mysteries in the life of our divine Lord in which she had a large part. She treasured up in her memory the words and events, meditated on them,

prayed over them in the silence and quiet of her chamber, thus ever increasing in faith, hope, and the love of God. Thus too she secured for herself the divine assistance, support and guidance and encouragement in the daily happenings and sufferings of her life on earth.

We ought to imitate this practice of our Blessed Mother in regard to so sacred an event in our life as our consecration to God. In the first place, we should recall it often and prayerfully. Many religious have the commendable custom of making the renewal of their consecration part of their morning prayer, using for the purpose a short formula; even purely mental renewal is beneficial. We may do the same at intervals between exercises during the day, even in the course of work which does not require close and continuous attention. Our Blessed Lady gave us the example. Doubtless her mind and heart were frequently, if not habitually, occupied with thoughts of some of the great mysteries in the life of her divine Son. This kept her in a state of recollection, transforming all her work into prayer. Because of the difference of circumstances and the nature of their occupation, religious living in the modern world with its multiplicity of work are unable to practise recollection to the same extent to which our Blessed Lady practised it in her home at Nazareth. Nevertheless, we must not lose sight of the fact that some degree of recollection is essential for living the religious life as it should be lived. For all religious, whether members of an active or contemplative order, are consecrated to God. Consecration means total devotion to the cause of God, the cause of Christ and His Church. But they cannot effectively promote the cause of Christ unless they are devoted to prayer. And the prayer of consecrated souls must be something more than a casual and routine performance at stated times and places. Religious must be penetrated and imbued with the true spirit of prayer, which comes only with thought and reflection and intimate converse between God and the soul. How can they achieve this spirit and continue it once they have achieved it if they do not strive with all the means at their disposal to attain to some degree of interior recollection? It is easier to keep up a high degree of recollection in some positions or spheres of duty than in others. This holds of all religious communities whose members are engaged in the active life. But to whatever duty individual religious are assigned, all

must remember that their life of prayer, their spiritual life in general, will not take care of itself. The saying is true that no one will be much more in prayer than he or she is out of prayer. In other words, they who outside of prayer scatter their attention over a variety of interests, neither necessary nor useful for their work, will be unable to pray well beyond a few minutes when the hour comes for their devotional exercises. The inference is not that recollection is to interfere with attention to duty. Duty comes first. But there are moments and intervals when thoughts are free from assigned work and the employment of time is left to each one's discretion. These are favorable moments for the care and attention which religious ought to have for their personal spiritual welfare. And if at such times they follow the promptings of mere curiosity, seeking the news of the day or other information not necessary or useful for them, thus spending the time in useless reading or idle conversation, they are losing precious opportunities for sanctifying themselves.

I said above that, in the first place, we ought frequently and prayerfully to recall the fact of our consecration to God. It is a thought pregnant with meaning for all of us and will be a great aid to recollection in the course of the day. Secondly, it will be decidedly profitable to take our consecration now and then for the subject of daily meditation. In such a meditation we may first consider the *meaning* of our consecration. It means complete dedication to God by means of the three vows, oblation of all that we have, all that we are, all that we are able to do—our thoughts, words, and actions; it means an act of the most perfect love of God. Then we may reflect on its *obligations*. They are the observance of the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience; of the rules and constitutions of the order, and obedience to the commands of superiors. Finally, we may think of its *advantages*. The most important ones are that it frees us from many serious dangers of sin, furnishes numerous aids in the practice of every kind of virtue, aligns us with that choice company of the army of Christ which would signalize itself by special service to its Leader, renders us sacred in the eyes of God, is a sign of God's predilection, has Christ's promise of the highest reward—they "shall receive a hundredfold and shall possess life everlasting" (Matthew 19:29). *Conclusion.* We may con-

clude with sentiments of esteem and love of our vocation with its consecration to God; humility; gratitude to God.

Another opportunity for strengthening ourselves in our consecration to God is the Monthly Recollection. It is a time of spiritual grace, when God reveals Himself more fully to our souls. We should do our part by making a brief survey of the month that has passed, considering in detail and with more than ordinary scrutiny whether we are living up to the requirements of our state. It is not a question of merely seeing whether we have avoided deliberate sin. This too merits our attention, as a matter of course. We must look to our religious ideals, the perfection of our daily actions, the motives that animate us from early morning till late at night. Are we seeking God in all things in all our doings? Are Jesus Christ and His interests habitually in our thoughts, or is self frequently uppermost in our minds, controlling and directing our purposes and policies? Our Blessed Lord said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind, and with thy whole strength" (Mark 12:30). This is the perfection we are bound to strive after in its literal sense. It is the epitome, the compendium of all that is contained in our consecration to God.

We are consecrated to God, sacred in His eyes. It would be quite wrong and detrimental to our spiritual life if, by reason of this, we were to fall into the error of conceiving and fostering self-complacency, as though we were the favorites of Almighty God and better than other people. If God has manifested His predilection towards us by bestowing the efficacious grace of a religious vocation, He has by that very fact also imposed on us graver obligations and responsibilities. In all humility we should thank God for what He has done for us and for all other men, each of us saying with the patriarch Jacob, "I am not worthy of the least of all thy mercies and of thy truth which thou hast fulfilled to thy servant" (Genesis 32:10).

It is very important for us to maintain an attitude of thankfulness and humility. Let us remember our Lord's words to His Apostles: "You have not chosen me, but I have chosen you" (John 15:16). He has chosen us out of the world and transferred us into a kingdom of light and grace that, like the Apostles, we might "bring forth fruit."

It remains for us to distinguish ourselves in His service by an ever increasing love and generosity, a more steadfast loyalty to the consecration which we made of ourselves when we pronounced our vows.

In this way a big fundamental spiritual truth, kept fresh in mind and heart by daily prayer and recollection, will exercise a salutary influence on the little things of every day life. It will have the effect of sweeping aside in a moment the petty and narrow views arising from selfishness, just as the bright rising sun scatters the mist on a midsummer day.

JOHN NEPOMUCENE NEUMANN

Just before the first issue of REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS went to press, we received a letter from the Reverend Albert H. Waible, C.S.S.R., Vice-Postulator of the Cause for Beatification of the Venerable John Neumann, C.S.S.R. John Nepomucene Neumann was the first professed Redemptorist in the United States and the fourth Bishop of Philadelphia. On December 11, 1921, Pope Benedict XV approved the decree declaring that John Neumann had practised heroic virtue, and he was given the title of Venerable. The Holy Father's words on that occasion are singularly appropriate for readers of REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS:

"We deem it proper to say that all our children should profit by the Decree of today by reason of the peculiar character of the heroic virtues of Ven. Neumann. Perhaps the very simplicity of these virtues has been misunderstood by those who thought there was no heroic degree in the virtues of the Servant of God, because in their eyes the good works and holy deeds performed by Neumann are the holy and good deeds which every good religious, every zealous missionary, every good bishop should perform. We need not repeat that works even the most simple, performed with constant perfection in the midst of inevitable difficulties, spell heroism in any servant of God. Just because of the simplicity of his works, We find in them a strong argument for saying to the faithful of whatever age, sex, or condition: You are all bound to imitate the Ven. Neumann If, in spite of this, there should be some who still seem surprised and cannot picture him to themselves as a hero apart from grand undertakings, We hasten to say that wonderful results can spring from simple deeds, provided these are performed as perfectly as possible and with unremitting constancy."

Those interested in Bishop Neumann's cause can procure a small pamphlet biography from the Mission Church Press, 1545 Tremont St., Boston, Mass. 5 cents a copy; \$3.50 per 100.

The Vow of Poverty in the Code of Canon Law

Adam C. Ellis, S.J.

"BLESSED are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew 5:3). This poverty of spirit for which the Gospel promises the kingdom of heaven consists essentially in keeping one's heart free from attachment to temporal goods. It is the first means, though not the most important, which man must make use of to win heaven or to attain to perfection. The reason for this is that poverty of spirit is the cure for that evil which is the root of all others according to the Apostle: "For covetousness is the root of all evil" (I Timothy 6:10). That is why our Lord not only began his preaching with it, but also gave us the example in His own person of a life of poverty from the crib in the stable of Bethlehem to the cross on Calvary. And when He wished to teach men the secret and the way of perfection, he tells us again, in the instance of the rich young man, that poverty is the starting point. If thou wilt be perfect, go sell what thou hast and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me" (Matthew 19:21). The first persons who took this lesson to heart and put it into practice were the Apostles, who in turn imparted it to the primitive church, and thus impressed upon religious communities the form of perfect poverty.

In canon 488 of the Code of Canon Law, the Church tells us that the three vows of religion, obedience, chastity, and poverty, are means by which religious strive after perfection. Hence in all orders and congregations approved by the Church these three essential vows must be taken, either explicitly, as in modern congregations, or as least implicitly, as in the older orders. In its essentials the vow of poverty is the same for all religious, but the constitutions of different orders and congregations add details to these fundamental notions according to the particular spirit of each institute.

Evangelical poverty as set forth in the constitutions of a religious institute, may be considered from different points of view. It is not our intention to give an ascetical or a moral interpretation of the vow of poverty; we leave

that to others, who, we trust, will favor us later on with articles in the REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS dealing with these aspects. It is our purpose now to study the present laws of the Church regarding the personal poverty of religious, as promulgated in the Code of Canon Law, since these laws are applicable to all religious, and are usually incorporated into the constitutions of all religious institutes.

The Nature of the Vow of Poverty. The vow of poverty is a promise made to God by which the religious deprives himself of the right to place any act of proprietorship over any material thing having a money value, without the lawful permission of his superior.

The proper and distinctive character of proprietorship or ownership of property is the power to dispose of it *freely and independently*: that is, to use it, to give it away, to sell it, to destroy it, *at will*, as an absolute master over it, without any obligation of having recourse to the will of another, hence independently of the will or permission of another.

The essence of the simple vow of poverty consists, therefore, in the privation of this right to dispose freely and independently of temporal goods, of whatsoever kind they may be. The subject-matter of the vow is the possession and use of temporal things, independently of the will of superiors.

Whatever the degree of poverty prescribed by the constitutions of any particular institute may be, only such things as come under the heading of temporal goods or property constitute the subject-matter of poverty. Other things, such as health, the use of one's bodily members, one's mental and spiritual faculties, talents, supernatural gifts, are not the subject-matter of the vow of poverty.

Temporal goods or property, therefore, include any object of money value that a person can acquire and possess or hold, anything that can be owned. Personal goods or property are such things as can be kept on or near one's person, usually all movable goods. Real property or real estate consists in lands and whatever is attached to the land, houses and buildings of any kind. The general term, property or temporal goods, therefore, comprises every material thing which has a money value, such as: money, real estate, stocks, bonds, mortgages, jewelry, and all movable and personal objects having a money value. By his vow of poverty

the religious renounces his right to place any act of ownership over such goods without the permission of his superior. The vow of poverty, therefore, forbids the religious: 1) every independent act of *appropriation*, e.g. to acquire, keep, use, receive, borrow from another; 2) every act of *disposal* of property: to give away, to sell, to lend, or lease to another, to allow goods to deteriorate or perish. All these acts, placed without the permission of the superior or of the constitutions, are contrary to the vow of poverty. The various degrees of sinfulness of these acts is a moral question and outside the limits of this article.

Let us now take up the general legislation of the Church regarding the vow of poverty, keeping in mind that these laws obligate all religious, and that any contrary legislation in the constitutions has been revoked by the Code of Canon Law, unless a special apostolic privilege has been obtained.

I. *A religious who has taken a simple vow of poverty, whether temporary or perpetual, retains the ownership of his property, as well as the capacity to acquire more, unless the constitutions provide otherwise* (cf. canon 580, §1).

The distinction between a simple and a solemn vow is the result of church legislation. A religious who takes a solemn vow of poverty deprives himself not only of every right to place acts proprietorship, as explained above, but he freely gives up even the *right to own* temporal goods. Such a religious must give away all that he possesses, within sixty days preceding his solemn profession. After taking the solemn vow, he can no longer acquire temporal goods for himself, since by his vow he has renounced his very right to own, hence whatever may come to him by way of inheritance or gift, he acquires for his institute (cf. canons 581 and 582).

The religious who takes a simple vow of poverty, on the contrary, retains his right to own, that is to possess property; hence he is not deprived of his property by the simple vow, but continues to be the owner of all that he possessed at the time of his religious profession. Furthermore, he retains the capacity to acquire more property or temporal goods even after he has taken the simple vow of poverty. Such is the provision of the general law of the Church today for all religious. The Church allows the constitutions to limit this right, but since there are very few

constitutions which do so, we shall omit any comment on this detail, and we shall suppose hereafter that no such limitation has been placed.

II. *The simple vow of poverty makes a contrary act illicit, but not invalid, unless the contrary has been expressly decreed (cf. canon 579).*

The effects of the vow of poverty are determined by the law of the Church. That law says that the simple vow of poverty makes a contrary act illicit, which means that if a religious with a simple vow of poverty disposes of or in any way exercises rights over his property without permission, he commits a sin, venial or grave according to the gravity of the illicit transaction. However, the act which he places, for example, the gift or sale of temporal goods, is valid, that is, it is recognized as legal by canon law, unless the contrary is expressly decreed. Such a prohibition may be contained in the general law of the Church, as happens in the case of a religious who takes a simple vow of poverty in an order in which he is to take solemn vows later on. Canon 581 § 1 forbids him under pain of invalidity to give away his property, except within sixty days preceding his solemn profession. If such a religious gives away any property, the act is null and void, which means that the person to whom he gave it must return it, and may not keep it. Thus if Sister Generosa, a member of a religious congregation, gave all her property to her needy family on the day on which she took her first vows, her parents may keep it, since the act is a valid act. Sister Generosa, however, acted illicitly, that is, she violated her vow of poverty by transgressing the law of the church, unless she did so in good faith, being ignorant of the law. On the other hand, if Brother John, a member of the Carmelite order, gave away all his property on the day he took his first simple vows, the person to whom he gave it would be obliged to give it back to him, because his act was not only illicit but also invalid. He can give away his property validly only within sixty days of his solemn profession.

III. *If during his novitiate, a novice in any way whatever renounces his property, or encumbers it, such a renunciation or encumbrance is not only illicit, but also null and void (cf. canon 568).*

This legislation comes down to us from the Council of Trent. It applies to all novices, whether in a pontifical or

in a diocesan institute, and to all their temporal goods, whether movable or immovable, real or personal. The purpose of the legislation is to safeguard the freedom of action of both the novice and of the institute regarding the profession to be made at the end of the novitiate. The novice may wish to leave, the institute may be unwilling to admit him to profession. Hence the wisdom of the legislation.

To *renounce* one's property means to give up the right to it by freely and lawfully transferring it to another without recompense. A novice may, therefore, sell his property and invest the proceeds, or put the money in a bank for the time being. He may, likewise, freely dispose of the income of his property during the novitiate, or add it to his capital. He must pay his debts, of course, and may pay for his board and clothing during the novitiate provided this is required by the constitutions, or agreed upon before entrance into the postulancy or novitiate in conformity with canon 570, § 1.

To *encumber* one's property means to put a burden or obligation upon it. Hence a novice may not promise to give away a certain part of his property or all of it on condition that he perseveres in the religious state and is admitted to profession. He may not mortgage his property, as that would be placing an encumbrance upon it.

While the law of the Church does not forbid such renunciation and encumbrance during the postulancy, the same reasons make such an act inadvisable. If such a renunciation is made for grave reason during the postulancy, it should be made conditionally, so that the postulant may be able to regain his property in case he does not persevere in religion, and must return to the world.

Even before the Code went into effect it was a common opinion of canonists that novices could give alms to the poor, to pious causes, and even to their own institute, provided that small amounts were given on rare occasions. The same is permitted under the Code. Thus a novice would be allowed to have a number of Masses said for the repose of the soul of his father or mother who dies during his novitiate.

Supposing that our novice perseveres, and that his institute is ready to admit him to his first profession, the law of the Church requires him to place certain acts in regard to his property before he takes his first vows.

IV. *Before the profession of simple vows, whether temporary or perpetual, the novice must cede, for the entire period during which he will be bound by simple vows, the administration of his property to whomsoever he wishes, and dispose freely of its use and usufruct, unless the constitutions determine otherwise (cf. canon 569, § 1).*

We have seen above that the simple vow of poverty does not deprive the novice who takes it of the ownership of his property or of the right to acquire more property after he has taken the simple vow of poverty. On the other hand, one of the purposes of the vow is to free the religious from the worries and distractions connected with the care and management of temporal goods. Hence the Church wisely decrees that the novice must turn over to another the administration of his property if he has any. He may choose any person he wishes to act as his administrator: his parents, a brother or sister, a friend, a lawyer, a trust company. He may also ask his institute or province or house to assume this task if superiors are willing to accept it.

Let us understand what an administrator is. All of us have heard on occasion, after the death of a person, that the deceased had appointed an administrator of his estate in his will, or if he died intestate, the court appointed somebody to fill this office until the estate could be settled. The person appointed cares for the estate or collection of temporal goods owned by the deceased, pay bills, collects rents, as well as interest on money deposited in banks or due on stocks and bonds, keeps buildings in repair, pays taxes and the like. In a word, an administrator performs all those ordinary acts which the deceased person performed during his lifetime for the preservation and increase of his property. Once the novice has appointed his administrator, he must leave to him all these acts of ordinary administration of his property. He may be consulted as regards extraordinary acts of administration, such as the sale of his property, and the investment of the money derived from such a sale, and he has the right to receive an annual report of the condition of his property. The administrator is entitled to some recompense in proportion to his labor. Once the administrator has been freely appointed, the religious may not replace him by another without the permission of his superior general, unless the constitutions of his institute allow him to do so of his own accord (cf. canon

580, § 3). It is evident that the novice who has no property at the time of his first profession need not appoint an administrator.

The disposition of his income: The novice must dispose freely of the use and usufruct of his property, if he has any. If his property consists of real estate, a farm, a house and lot, etc. he may grant the use of such property to anybody he wishes. If his property is productive, real estate which brings in rents, or stocks and bonds producing income or interest, such income is called the fruits of his property, or the usufruct. It is evident that were the religious to retain the free disposal of such income in his own hands, it would become a source of distraction and worry to him. Hence the Code prescribes that, before he takes his first vows, he must determine, once for all, the person or persons who are to be given the use of or the income of his property for the duration of his vows. He may choose whomsoever he wishes as the beneficiary of his income: his parents, a brother or sister, some charitable work, his own institute. It would be well for the novice, before making his decision, to think seriously on those words of our Lord: "give to the poor." His parents may be in need, or he may have a brother or sister struggling to raise a family or to get an education; then there are so many forms of Christian charity in need of funds to carry on their work: hospitals, orphanages, homes for the poor, etc; lastly the novice should also consider the needs of his own institute before coming to a decision. But the final decision rests with him, unless the constitutions of his institute determine otherwise. There are some constitutions approved before the promulgation of the Code which deprive the novice of the right to dispose of the use and usufruct of his property, or restrict that right or define it, e.g. by limiting such disposal in favor of a charitable work, or by designating or excluding the institute as the beneficiary. Whatever the dispositions of such constitutions may be, they must be observed (Code Commission, Oct. 16, 1919).

Once the novice has made this disposition of the use or income of his property, he may not change it in favor of someone else without the permission of his superior general, unless the constitutions allow him to do so of his own accord (canon 580, § 3). It will be well to call attention here to a restriction which this same canon places on the

right to change the beneficiary with the permission of the superior general. Such modification or change must not be made, at least for a notable part of the income, in favor of the institute. Permission of the Holy See is necessary to make such a change in favor of the institute (Code Commission, May 15, 1936), if there is question of a *notable* part, say one-fourth, or certainly one-third of the same. This point should be made clear to the novice before he chooses the person who is to have the use or the income of his property. While he is free before taking his first vows to appoint his own institute (or his province or house) as the beneficiary of his income, if as a matter of fact, he does not do so, but appoints some other person, he may not later change this disposition in favor of his institute without the permission of the Holy See, if there is question of one third or more of the entire income.

If, later on, after having taken his vows, the religious should leave his institute and the religious life, these appointments of an administrator and of the beneficiary of his income cease to have any effect, and he regains complete control of his property.

It may happen that a novice has no property at the time he takes his first vows. Later on, after taking his vows, he acquires property by inheritance or gift. What is to be done?

V. *In case the novice, because he possessed no property, omitted to make the cession and disposition mentioned above, but later on acquires property, or if, after making the cession and disposition in question, he becomes the possessor of more property under whatever title, he must then make the cession and disposition for the first time, or repeat it, in regard to the newly acquired property, his simple vow of poverty notwithstanding (cf. canon 569, § 2).*

In this case the religious who possessed no property at the time of his first profession, but later on acquires property, needs no permission to appoint an administrator and to determine who is to have the use of this newly acquired property, or the income thereof. The law obliges him to do so. Similarly, if, after having appointed an administrator and determined a beneficiary of the income of his property, a religious, after taking his vows, acquires new property by inheritance, gift, and so forth, he must then

repeat the same acts in regard to his newly acquired property. Of course he may simply say: "I wish the same administrator, already appointed, to take care of it, and I wish the same person or persons, already receiving the income of my property, to receive the income of this new property likewise." He may, however, appoint a different person administrator, and a different person the beneficiary of the income of this newly acquired property, if he wishes to do so. It may be noted in passing that an *increase in value* of property already possessed does not constitute a new acquirement of property within the meaning of the law. Hence if the real estate, or the stocks and bonds which a religious owns, increase in value because of a land boom, or because of a rise in the stock market, such a religious may not consider that increase in value as a new acquirement of property. Nothing is to be done in such a case.

VI. *In every religious congregation the novice, before taking his temporary vows, must freely make a will or testament regarding all the property he actually possesses, or may subsequently possess (cf. canon 569, § 3).*

A will is a legal declaration of a man's intentions as to the disposition of his property that he wills to be carried out after his death. Strictly speaking, a testament differs from a will in that it bequeaths personal property only; but the terms are used interchangeably. By his will, therefore, the novice does not give away his property here and now. He merely indicates the person or persons whom he wishes to come into possession of it *after his death*. As long as he lives he retains the ownership of all his property. The beneficiary of his will becomes possessor of the property of the religious only after the latter dies. Every novice in a religious *congregation* must make a will before taking his first, temporary vows, whether he actually owns any property or not, the reason being that the will includes everything that may come to the religious during his lifetime, and of which he dies possessed.

Novices about to take their first, temporary vows in an order are not obliged to make a will, since they must give away whatever they possess before they take their solemn vows. They are not forbidden, however, to make a will valid for the period of their profession of simple vows, should they wish to do so.

Members of a religious congregation who took their

first vows before the Code went into effect (May 19, 1918), are not obliged to make a will, even though they acquired more property after that date, or will acquire such property in the future. But they are not forbidden to make a will, should they wish to do so, and generally speaking, it is advisable for them to make a will. But all religious in every congregation who took their first, temporary vows after May 19, 1918 are obliged to make a will as soon as possible, if they have not done so already. The law requires this, even though it had been omitted in good faith.

Even though the novice who is about to take his first vows cannot make a will valid in civil law because of a lack of the required age, he is still bound by canon law to make his will, and later on, when he becomes of legal age, he must take the steps necessary to make his will valid in civil law as well.

The Code says that the novice must *freely* make a will. This does not mean that he is free to make a will or not, but that he who makes the will prescribed by canon law is free to choose the beneficiary of his will, that is he freely chooses the person or persons he wishes to take possession of any property he may own at the time of his death.

May a religious ever change his will after he has freely made it?

VII. *No religious may change his will once made in conformity with the requirements of canon law as explained above without the permission of the Holy See, or, in case of urgency, and time does not permit of recourse to the Holy See, without the permission of his superior general, or of his local superior if the former cannot be reached (cf. canon 583, 2°).*

A will is not considered altered or changed if certain prescriptions are merely made clearer, or if a will which is invalid in civil law is changed merely to conform with the requirements of that law, so long as in both cases the beneficiary remains the same. Should the person named as beneficiary in the will of a religious die, the will becomes ineffective and has no value. Hence no permission is needed to make a new will, since by so doing the religious is simply fulfilling the law of the Church which requires him to make a will. The will he had made is no longer valid, hence he is without a will, and must make another in order to fulfill the law.

As long as the religious with simple vows continues to live in a religious congregation he may not give away his property.

VIII. *It is forbidden to the professed of simple vows in a congregation to abdicate gratuitously the dominion over their property by a voluntary deed of conveyance* (cf. canon 583, 1°).

To abdicate gratuitously means to give away one's property without receiving any monetary recompense in return. The motive for giving away one's property may be a spirit of gratitude, or friendship, or a charitable desire to help others in need, or to further the cause of some pious work. No matter what the motive may be, the Church forbids all religious with simple vows in a congregation to give away their property as long as they remain in religion. Due to the uncertain times in which we live, it can and does happen that religious freely leave or are obliged to leave their institute, or the institute itself may be dispersed by reason of persecution which is always present in the Church in some part of the world. Should any one of these contingencies arise, the religious will not be obliged to return to the world penniless, thus bringing shame on religion, or becoming a burden to others, but he will be able to support himself with the aid of the temporal goods he brought with him when he entered religion, or which he received by way of inheritance or gift during his stay in the religious life.

Since the law says a religious is forbidden to give away his property, but does not say that such an act is invalid as it does in the case of a novice and of the religious with simple vows in an order in which he is to take solemn vows later on, it follows that if a religious in a congregation has actually freely given away his property contrary to the prescription of the law, the act is a valid act, and the religious cannot reclaim his property. If he did so in good faith, in ignorance of the law, he will be free from all moral guilt in the matter. But all religious in congregations, whether papal or diocesan, should understand clearly that their superiors cannot give them permission to dispose of their patrimony, as the sum total of their temporal goods is called, during their lifetime in religion. The permission of the Holy See would have to be obtained before this could be done licitly.

A final question arises with regard to the property of a

religious with simple vows. We have seen that such a religious retains his ownership over the property he possessed at the time of his entrance into religion, as well as the capacity to acquire more property, even after he has taken his simple vow of poverty. How are we to decide what a religious may and must keep and add to his patrimony, what he must give to his institute of the temporal things which come to him during his life in religion?

IX. *Whatever a religious acquires by his own industry, or in respect to his institute, he acquires for his institute* (cf. canon 580, § 2).

A religious with simple vows acquires for himself, that is, as part of his patrimony or collection of his temporal possessions, whatever he receives by way of inheritance, legacy or personal gift. But whatever comes to him by reason of his own industry goes to his institute. *To acquire by one's own industry* means by one's mental and physical efforts, such as writing a book, or making a work of art, a painting or fancy needle work, or by reason of one's profession, recompense received for teaching, nursing and the like. Since the religious has become a member of the religious family by his profession of vows, and is supported, fed, clothed and educated by the institute, which supplies all his reasonable wants, it is but meet and just that the fruits of his labors should go to the institute.

To acquire in respect to the institute refers to what is given to a religious not as an individual person, to John Jones, or to Mary Blank, but to the religious as a religious, to Brother Pius, or to Sister Martha, for the community to which he or she belongs, in order to help the charitable or educational work in which the community is engaged, or because of the confidence and respect which the institute as a whole inspires in the donor because of its religious activity. In a word a religious acquires in respect to his institute whatever is given to him *because he is a religious*. In cases of doubt, when it is not certain that the gift was personal to the religious, the presumption will be that it was made in favor of the institute. This presumption applies especially to superiors. Small gifts given on special occasions such as feast days or at Christmas time to a teacher by his pupils, and so forth, are presumed to be given to the religious because he is a religious, not for personal reasons. The constitutions usually regulate such gifts.

The Education of Sisters¹

William J. McGucken, S.J.

THIS IS an altogether extraordinary book that should be of particular interest to the readers of the REVIEW FOR RELIGIOUS. It is not a dull book, despite the fact that it is in the genre of the much despised doctoral dissertations in Education (with a capital E). Sister Bertrande has a reporter's sense of what constitutes news, a reporter's ability to penetrate beyond the barriers and get a "story" from her unwilling victim. Very briefly, the book is the narrative of what has been done in America for the religious, social, cultural, and professional education of sisters, what is being done, and, most significant of all, what should be done. With the first two parts of the book no one can disagree; the facts are presented with such ingenious clarity that he who runs may read. In the third part one may question some of the proposals on the ground that they are too detailed, too rigidly regimented after the immemorial fashion of nuns, but with the main features of her proposal to give a truly sound and truly Catholic education (this time without the capital E) to American nuns there can be no disagreement.

The true story of Catholic education in the United States, especially the education of women, has yet to be written; its tale of heroisms, sacrifices, blunderings, and fatal failures have been chronicled in part here and there, notably in Mother Callan's excellent study, *The Society of the Sacred Heart in North America*, but nowhere can one find a complete picture of the whole scene. Particularly is this the case with American Catholic educational policy as it affects the religious *qua* religious. The old saying "Cucullus non facit monachum" is all too dreadfully true, but unfortunately many religious superiors believed the wimple made the nun. Every religious over fifty years of age knows that there was a time in the history of the sisterhoods in America when a young woman, often not even a high school graduate, was passed through a rapid postu-

¹ THE EDUCATION OF SISTERS. A plan for Integrating the Religious, Social, Cultural, and Professional Training of Sisters. By Sister Bertrande Meyers. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1941. Pp. xxxiii + 255. \$3.75.

lancy, given a veil, and sent out to teach. Granted that mother superiors were forced by circumstances, the importunings of bishops and parish priests, granted that the nuns thus sent off the assembly line with less than a year's training made up for their lack of acquaintance with the whole idea and ideals of religious life by their practices of piety, their simple devotion, their childlike faith, yet it still remains an inscrutable mystery of divine providence that there were not more individual catastrophes as a result of this short-sighted policy.

The first World War came along; there was a multiplication of schools, especially of sisters' high schools and colleges; there was also a tightening of the reins by the accrediting agencies. Moreover, Rome was insistent on religious communities adhering to their constitutions. At last, it is true, the nuns were obliged to spend at least a canonical year in the novitiate, but in order to satisfy the professional requirements necessary to teach, many of the sisterhoods had to resort to miserable subterfuges in order to secure these "credits." A tragic story, truly, this filching from the religious training of the novice to satisfy the craze for credits. Nor is it over even now. Sister Bertrande says (of the year 1940):

"Isolated instances were even found where credit was given [during the Canonical Year] in Church History or World History for reading Lives of the Saints, in Home Economics for the daily domestic work, and in Philosophy of Education for the daily instructions of the Mistress of Novices.

"One of the Mistresses of Novices complains bitterly:

" 'In the first place, there is a six month's postulate. But, before the postulant can be inducted into religious life she is made conscious of credits to be earned towards her teaching credentials; so her day is full of classes. That is not so bad, since this is just the Postulate, but it would be better if she studied something like Logic—that would teach her how to think. But no. Methods of teaching, all professional subjects come together to make the girl more conscious of the need to become a good teacher rather than a true religious.

" 'Then—the Canonical Year. It is so taken up with studies in the field of education that when a novice is asked how she is coming along in recollection, she says: "Recollec-

tion? Why I can think of nothing but getting my school work done—there is no time even for class preparation." Spiritual exercises are curtailed; classwork takes precedence over interviews with the Mistress of Novices—often I have to scheme little ways of finding an opportunity to give direction to a novice who stands in need.

"Two and one-half hours a day are allowed for Novitiate routine such as instructions, spiritual reading, confessions, etc. If anything must be put aside it must be anything but classwork. Thus it happens that a thin, superficial religious decorum takes the place of depth and breadth in the spiritual life. And no real, permanent culture comes from this cramming of normal work.

"The second year the novices are sent out to teach. They go out to teach with good will, but with no concept of the interior life. There was a time when the second year was strictly a part of the Novitiate; but it began with "borrowing" two or three novices for sorely pressed missions, and the borrowed novices were never returned. Then, a few more were borrowed. Now, there is no pretence at leaving them in the Novitiate for a second year. They are robbed of their Canonical Year with a full program of studies; the second year they leave for the local schools, and as a result we have teachers with no real understanding of their Community or of the obligations of religious life'."

It should be noted that this condition has held ever since the State Departments have insisted on professional requirements for teachers; it still holds today, let us hope only in "isolated instances." It can be left to the reader's imagination what the situation was in the period immediately after World War I when every major superior was confronted with the choice of closing a certain number of schools or getting credits for her sisters somehow, somewhere. The result: a conflict was set up in the mind of the young religious; she was told that her spiritual development comes first, and yet much was done to interfere with her allowing her religious life to take first place.

A very interesting part of the book is Sister Bertrande's discussion of the effect of secular universities on religious women. The majority of provincials, mistresses of novices, deans of nuns' colleges feel that it does harm, that there is a weakening of the Catholic sense, but some are sure that they are forced to attend for certain courses in the graduate field.

It is not explicitly stated that the real reason for the danger to sisters at secular graduate schools is the haphazard quality of the undergraduate preparation received by many of them; they have not a Catholic view of life, even though they may be very devout religious.

"One point was uniformly expressed — that the courtesy and consideration which sisters met in dealing with the officials and the faculties in secular universities outdistanced that which was experienced in Catholic centers." One just wonders if it is not possible that the more poorly prepared for graduate work attend Catholic universities, the brilliant students, the ones superiors are absolutely sure of, frequent the non-Catholic institution. Moreover, Catholic institutions have possibly far more experience of those "isolated instances" where nuns present transcripts of worthless credits than the officials of the secular universities. It is gratifying to see from Sister Bertrande's tables that there is a tremendous increase in the attendance of sisters at Catholic institutions and a corresponding decrease in attendance at secular universities.

One startling fact in the picture presented of the contemporary education of Catholic sisters is this: relatively few of our nuns receive a thorough grounding in liberal arts. Even where the situation in the Canonical Year has been bettered, it is very rare indeed for a sister to be set aside to complete her course for the Bachelor of Arts degree. Where there is a second year of novitiate, studies are crowded into this year—too many, alas, professional studies; that year ended, the novice pronounces her vows and is immediately sent on a mission. Carrying a full teaching schedule, she attempts to garner credits after school hours, on Saturday mornings, and in summer sessions. After she has attained the mystical number of 120, she may be sent to graduate school, utterly unprepared for graduate work by this hurried amassing of credits which she has had no time to digest. It is not thus that bachelors of arts are made. One can say that many, not all, bachelors of arts in American colleges are in no better fix. This may be true, but the fact remains that sisters because of their profession as teachers should be thoroughly grounded in systematic fashion in the liberal arts. What this crowding of the day of the young religious does to her spiritual life can be left to the imagination. If this or a similar condition were bad a

generation ago, when life was simpler, when our novices came from good Catholic families with a tradition of religious practice, what must it not be today when we find the product even of our convent schools woefully lacking in Catholic principles and practices because of poor home training and the prevalent paganism of the American scene.

Sister Bertrande's plan for the education of postulants, with its emphasis on instruction in Catholic faith and practice, so necessary at all times but especially in these times, its ignoring of all secular subjects except Speech and Music, is especially commended to all major superiors. So too her plan for the Canonical Year—one might wish that this part were continued everywhere for two years—with its rigid exclusion of everything but Religion and Gregorian Music will help to make our sisters strong religious women. Some will quarrel with the curriculum Sister Bertrande outlines for the two-year curriculum for the Community Junior College. Too many of the courses, some would think, bear the mark of superficiality so characteristic of survey courses. However, that is a minor detail. The one point is brought out that the postulancy and novitiate are devoted to God and the development of the spiritual life in the individual; two years of junior college are to be added to complete the foundation of their liberal arts program, with the leisure necessary for that purpose. After that Sister Bertrande recommends that the new sister be sent to a Catholic college for the completion of the work that is needed for the degree. The author does not say that they should be sent immediately. Perhaps it is too far away from the practicalities of American convent life for her to recommend that.

All in all this is a book that should be read and digested by everyone who has anything to do with the education of sisters,—major superiors, Catholic college professors and administrators, at least that they may acquire the *savoir faire* of their non-Catholic confrères, last but not least, pastors, that they may understand the difficulties under which the sisters in their parish schools are laboring. It is a book that had to be written; the candid objective presentation of facts can do no harm; it may prove to be of inestimable benefit to future generations of sisters, if present superiors heed the pointed lesson that is written here.

Hygienic Mortification

G. Augustine Ellard, S.J.

ONE of the most prominent ascetical writers of the twentieth century and at the same time an authority on the history of the spiritual life in the Church, namely, Msgr. Saudreau, states that the principal defect in the cultivation of the interior life in our days is a lack of bodily mortification (1). Moreover, the want of mortification is assigned by Father De Guibert, of Rome, a leader among contemporary ascetical and mystical theologians, as the reason why so few pass beyond mediocrity in the spiritual life (2).

Perhaps one of the main reasons or pretexts why most devout people do not practice more external mortification is the fear that it would injure their health, or at least lessen their strength and capacity for work. One might answer that an abundance of mortification, and that too of a superior form, may be found precisely in learning and living up to the principles of hygiene.

Let us assume, for the present purpose, that mortification consists in any or all acts of virtue in as much as these involve foregoing what is pleasant or undergoing what is unpleasant. Thus it would be coextensive with the sphere covered by the old rule of the Stoics: "bear and forbear."

Though the word mortification (putting to death) may suggest the contrary, all sound ascetical authorities would hold that the purpose of it is positive: life, and more life. If inferior vital tendencies are checked and thwarted, it is only in order that the higher vital tendencies may be saved from being checked and thwarted, and that they may be more freely and richly developed. By all means, the aim of sound mortification is more and better life rather than less. "Ever we bear about in our body the dying of Jesus, so that the life, too, of Jesus may be made manifest in our bodies. For we who live are ever being delivered up to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life, too, of Jesus may be made manifest in our mortal flesh" (II Corinthians 4:10-11 —Westminster Version).

(1) Auguste Saudreau, *La Piété à Travers Les Ages*, page 661.

(2) J. De Guibert, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, Fascicule Premier, page 106.

Hygienic mortification would consist in foregoing whatever is pleasant and undergoing whatever is unpleasant with a view to preserving, or improving, or regaining, one's health and vigor, and ultimately to furthering God's glory and to growing in that participation of the divine life which comes with grace. Three degrees of hygienic mortification may be distinguished: first, avoiding any sinful neglect in the care of one's health; second, steering clear of whatever would involve danger of such neglect; and third, refraining from whatever is less commendable in favor of the more commendable in this matter.

Health is either physical or psychical. For the present, let us confine our discussion to physical hygienic mortification. The psychic is more important in many respects, and more akin to the "interior mortification" of the spiritual masters. Possibly in a subsequest paper we may revert to it.

Up to a certain point there is a strict obligation from the divine natural law to care for one's life and health. "Thou shalt not kill," either others or thyself. It is ethical to regulate our conduct in accordance with rational human nature and to avoid what tends to damage or destroy it. This duty requires that one should use the ordinary means of safeguarding and preserving life and health. Nature is necessary for the supernatural life. If nature can do nothing in the supernatural order without grace, neither can grace do anything without nature. It is equally helpless. The Code of Canon Law, 1369, prescribes that those who are in charge of seminaries should exhort the seminarians constantly to observe the principles of hygiene and personal cleanliness. Presumably it is in keeping with the mind of the Church that religious should do at least as much.

One who is striving to become perfect will not stop with what is of strict obligation. He will constantly endeavor to do the better thing. The better thing will include whatever, other things being equal, is more conducive to bodily strength and efficiency.

God counsels solicitude for health. "Better is a poor man who is sound, and strong of constitution, than a rich man who is weak and afflicted with evils. Health of the soul in holiness of justice, is better than all gold and silver: and a sound body, than immense revenues. There is no riches above the riches of health of the body; and there is no pleasure above the joy of the heart. Better is death

than a bitter life: and everlasting rest, than continual sickness" (Ecclesiasticus 30:14-17). In his inspired epistle to Timothy, St. Paul did not disdain to give this advice to one of the first bishops: "Drink no longer water only, but use a little wine, on account of thy stomach and thy frequent illness" (I Timothy 5:23). The divine counsel to have a concern for health is implied in all the numerous exhortations to accomplish good works. As Pope Pius XI wrote in his "Encyclical on Education,"—something, by the way, especially deserving notice by teachers—"The true Christian does not . . . stunt his natural faculties; but he develops and perfects them, by coordinating them with the supernatural. He thus ennobles what is merely natural in life and secures for it new strength in the material and temporal order, no less than in the spiritual and eternal" (3).

This is not the place for a presentation of the principles of hygiene, nor, even if it were, should I be presumptuous enough to attempt such a thing. I should be like the patient in the medical adage: "He who has himself for a doctor, has a fool for a patient."

If any religious should not know the elementary rules of hygiene, that is, the rules for living on the physiological plane, then let him begin his hygienic mortification by taking the trouble to learn them. This is not an original suggestion of mine. A first-rate ascetical theologian of the twentieth century, namely, Zimmermann, the author of the excellent treatise *Lehrbuch der Aszetik*, counsels everyone seeking perfection to learn both the general principles of hygiene which may be studied, and the individual applications and variations which must be gathered by personal experience (4).

My attempt will be confined to indicating certain points on which the authorities in hygiene do have something to prescribe, and to suggesting certain possible deviations that may perchance be found among religious.

Posture might be considered first. Constantly to preserve a wholesome and becoming posture of the body would not only make for health, especially of the lungs, but it would also be something that would please others, and it would add to the influence of one's personality on others. Were it better observed, there would be fewer ill-looking

(3) Pius XI, *Christian Education of Youth*; The Paulist Press; page 37.

(4) Zimmermann, Otto. *Lehrbuch der Aszetik*, page 516.

religious whose very appearance is, to put it mildly, not pleasing nor apt to inspire respect in others.

Certain religious seem to be given to the use of an excessive amount of clothing. To see them out in winter weather, one might suspect from the great number of things which they are wearing, that they were planning on visiting the polar regions. Habitually they are over-dressed. Then, sooner or later, inevitably they are caught in some unexpected exposure to cold, and, being sensitive like hot-house plants, rather than possessing the normal adaptability to moderate variations in temperature, they may catch cold, or develop a sore-throat or something of the sort. In any case, one would not expect a man who is really mortified to be meticulous about slight changes in the temperature. Perhaps just the same persons are those who, believing that, as everything has its place, the proper place for fresh air in winter is outside, insist on an immoderately high temperature, and along with it, a bad atmosphere in the room. Thus they diminish their alertness and efficiency, and at the same time waste steam and coal.

Keeping the rules of etiquette at table would presumably be beneficial rather than harmful to one's health. At all events, it could be real charity and mortification. Certainly, very certainly, it would be a great kindness to others, and tend to promote good appetite and health in the community, as the neglect of good manners may be so great as to become disgusting to others. If there should be any religious who do not already know the ordinary prescriptions of table etiquette, then, by all means, let them get Emily Post, and study her. It could be a very genuine act of virtue.

Probably there are very few religious, those excepted who are already on a diet ordered by a physician, who could not make some change in their habits of eating and drinking that would not redound both to their physical well-being and to the glory of God. The right amount, the right balance of diet, the right way of taking it,—these are points in which it is most human to err. Some, like children, may be inclined to slight the simple, solid substantials, and to show themselves too fond of sweets, desserts, and such better-tasting things. Possibly there are some who could at the same time reduce the community butcher-bill and improve their health. Some, though they lead a very

sedentary life, may eat as if they had to dig ditches or pitch hay all day. It is often said now that many Americans, even those who eat as much as and whatever they like, are starving themselves for the want of certain necessary elements in their diet: vitamins, for instance. Perhaps some religious could drink less coffee, and thus improve their nerves, their tempers, their sleep, and their work.

The problems of overweight and underweight, and all their consequences, which may be very serious indeed, naturally suggest themselves in this context. Perhaps one religious needs to drink more milk, though he dislikes it, and another ought to take less of it, though he loves it. Possibly one religious should mortify his pride and ask for permission to have an extra lunch between meals, and another would do well to obtain leave to omit the midday lunch. Individual applications of this point are infinite. If one realizes that he should do something, but not know what, it would be easy to question the community physician and find out. There are many religious who could practice this particular form of hygienic mortification, and while making themselves more healthy and robust and fit for work and for a longer life, also add very greatly to the glory of God and the glory of His Elect in the hereafter.

If one were to accuse many male religious of smoking too much and thus really injuring themselves, one would only be repeating what they themselves accuse themselves of. Their opportunity is obvious, and the mortification involved would be great; but so would the returns, at least in supernatural merit. The possibilities for mortification and for edification in connection with alcohol need only to be suggested.

No doubt there are many religious, who, if they be well-informed and sincere, would have to admit that some change in their lives with respect to exercise would, even from the spiritual point of view, be an excellent thing for them. If they need more physical exercise and can get it in some pleasant way, relaxing the nerves and mind as well as stirring the muscles, so much the better. But get it they ought, if they are fully to accomplish the tasks assigned to them by Providence. If nothing else be possible, some form of calisthenics or setting-up exercises might be tried for a prescribed number of minutes every day. If anybody think that there is no great mortification in faithfully per-

severing in such a routine day after day and month after month, let him try it.

Many religious women would probably be spared many troubles of mind and conscience, would perform their exercises of piety with more energy and devotion, and would be more ready in their obedience and work, as well as more healthy, if they had a little walk every day in the fresh air. Younger sisters, who until rather recently were college girls taking part in college athletics, might play a short game of tennis, or something of the kind. It would make for sound nerves and clear heads, and these in turn could obviate many temptations and worries. It is true, indeed that St. Paul wrote to Timothy: "For whereas bodily training is profitable for little, piety is profitable for all things, possessing promise of life both here and hereafter" (I Timothy 4:8). I take this to mean that bodily training is of little value in comparison with piety; but in as much as it is subordinated to the purposes of virtue and is a requisite condition for more vigorous piety, or piety in a longer life, its worth may be really very great.

The ancient ascetics by way of reaction, it seems, to abuses connected with the old public baths, mortified themselves by not bathing. Could it be true that some modern ascetics might practice mortification and virtue by making more use of it?

Care of the eyes deserves special mention. Apparently there are many who could deny themselves at times by taking the trouble to get better light when they are reading.

Work, since it takes most of the time and energy of religious, is a very fertile field for mortification. Some overwork themselves for a time, and then for a longer time they cannot do the normal amount, and perhaps they even need the work of others to attend to them. Their problem is to avoid excess here, as in the practice of virtue generally. It would seem to be a good rule that there should never be overwork or overstrain except in emergencies. In the long run it is very poor economy and efficiency. They especially should cultivate self-abnegation in avoiding overfatigue who do not let superiors know that too much has been assigned to them, or who deceive themselves into believing that they are heroically sacrificing themselves for noble motives when in reality there is an admixture of pride or human respect or merely human desire of success in their

motivation. Sisters who in difficult days are attempting the double tasks of teaching and of getting their own education at the same time need more than others to guard themselves, even as the dreaded examinations approach, against overstudy and excessive exhaustion. Overfatigue begets irritability, diminishes intelligence and liberty, and unbalances the nerves. Then the way is open to evils of all sorts, physical, mental, and moral. "So that ye may not grow weary and lose heart" (Hebrews 12:3). Humbly to be satisfied with a modest accomplishment when that is all that is possible without injuring oneself, or diminishing one's achievement in the end, is a very salutary form of mortification.

There are others whose fault is too little exertion. Some of these could benefit themselves physically, and perhaps mentally, as well as spiritually, by increasing their efforts until they reach the mean between excess and defect. Occupational therapy is an important kind of treatment for certain cases.

After work, recreation and rest. For people who lead a life as strenuous and tense and uniform as the religious life is, recreation is of great importance. If they do not unbend at times, they will break. But are there not some religious who do not take even that minimum amount of recreation which is enjoined for them by their rules or their superiors? Here, in a peculiar way, to mortification charity could also be added. It is understood of course that what is supposed to be recreation or relaxation, really is recreation. Probably no one will deny that there are at least a few religious who could advance in self-abnegation, and in prayer (especially the next morning), and in virtue generally, by beginning their night's sleep betimes.

Thus far certain points which may be the subject of mortification that is good for the body as well as for the soul. Only those in normal health, or at least in health that is nearly normal, have been considered. If one be sick already, evidently one has a greater need for hygienic mortification, and a greater opportunity to bear what is unpleasant and to forbear what is pleasant.

Those who as yet are well, but, through some neglect or other, are slowly but surely undermining their health, could more easily and readily mend their ways if they could imagine to some slight extent what pain and torture, what

disappointment, what bitter sense of frustration, they are bringing upon themselves. Mortification is hard; otherwise it would not be mortification. But it is still worse to be sick and incapacitated, particularly if that be owing to some negligence or fault.

An initial, though negative, advantage of hygienic mortification is that nobody can object to it on the score that it might injure his health. By definition, it makes for better health. Then, it possesses the advantages and values of other forms of mortification, and besides, it is more thoroughly positive and constructive than some of them. It is real and genuine mortification, involving, as it does, the suppression of much that is pleasant and the enduring of much that is unpleasant. If anyone should think otherwise, he can try the experiment.

Religious have a special need of keeping fit physically. There is the importance, in time and eternity, of their work, and this depends in great measure on health and strength. An intense interior life—and this is always the ideal of religious—makes greater demands upon physical resources than the intellectual life, which in turn is hard enough upon the physique. The cultivation of mental prayer, of supreme importance in the spiritual life, demands that one's physical resources be at their best. Community observances require health in the members of the community, and if a sickly person drags himself along somehow to follow them, he is likely to become still worse and more incapable of continued community life.

The great foundress, St. Theresa of Avila, who knew well the problems of religious women, and particularly the difficulties of mental prayer, wrote: "It is this resolution [to be always thinking of Him and loving Him] that He [God] seeks in us; the other anxieties which we inflict upon ourselves serve to no other end but to disquiet the soul—which, if it be unable to derive any profit in one hour [of prayer], will by them be disabled for four. This comes most frequently from bodily indisposition—I have had very great experience in the matter, and I know it is true; for I have carefully observed it and discussed it afterwards with spiritual persons—for we are so wretched, that this poor prisoner of a soul shares in the miseries of the body. The changes of season, and the alterations of the humors, very often compel it, without fault of its own, not to do

what it would, but rather to suffer in every way. Meanwhile, the more we force the soul on these occasions, the greater the mischief, and the longer it lasts. Some discretion must be used, in order to ascertain whether ill-health be the occasion or not. The poor soul must not be stifled. Let those who suffer thus, understand that they are ill; a change should be made in the hour of prayer, and oftentimes that change should be continued for some days. Let souls pass out of this desert as they can, for it is very often the misery of one that loves God to see itself living in such wretchedness, unable to do what it would, because it has to keep so evil a guest as the body" (5).

Other things being equal, alacrity of spirit and intensity of good will in exercises of piety, in keeping religious discipline, and in doing the work of the order or congregation, are to be expected rather from those who are physically fit and strong than from those who are unfit.

The supernatural values of sickness and suffering are very great, but it is understood and presupposed that the illness should not be due to indiscretion or negligence.

Hygienic mortification will contribute to poverty, because it is cheaper to be well than to be paying for medicines, hospitalizations, and operations, and because healthy religious do more work. It will help chastity, by precluding certain temptations due to abnormal physical conditions, and by promoting that soundness and stability of the nervous system which are so necessary for self-control. It will promote obedience, by removing obstacles both to readiness of will and to actual performance, and by conferring greater positive strength and efficiency. It will enhance charity and perfection itself, by forestalling irritability and other impediments, and by enabling one to accomplish better and greater things for God and for souls.

The present incumbent of the See of Peter and his immediate predecessor seem to offer an illustration in point. If Msgr. Ratti had not been a very energetic Alpine climber, it is not likely that as Pius XI, and as a septuagenarian and an octogenarian, he could have achieved so much for the good of the Church. If I mistake not, the ascetical Cardinal Pacelli, while Secretary of State at the Vatican, used gymnastic apparatus installed in a room near his office.

(5) St. Theresa, *Life*, translated by D. Lewis: chapter XI.

There is one group of religious for whom hygienic mortification, as thus far suggested, is not at all recommended. They are the hypochondriacs, to be found here and there throughout the whole body of religious, that is, those who are already excessively or even morbidly solicitous about their health and all that appertains to it. For them it would be poison. However, they still need hygienic mortification: only it is of the psychic form. This they may need very much indeed.

To quote St. Theresa again: "Take care, then, of the body, for the love of God, because at many other times the body must serve the soul; and let recourse be had to some recreations—holy ones—such as conversation; or going out into the fields . . . Altogether, experience is a great matter, and it makes us understand what is convenient for us. Let God be served in all things—His yoke is sweet; and it is of great importance that the soul should not be dragged, as they say, but carried gently, that it may make greater progress" (6).

In conclusion, a religious practicing physical hygienic mortification, as here proposed, will not by any means put care of his health above things that are of greater value, but rather, with the purest and noblest motives, make the most of the physical constitution that God has given him, and thus be better prepared and disposed to accomplish the very utmost for the glory of the Triune God, for the development of his own supernatural life, and for the sanctification of his brethren. He would simply and fully be helping to carry out the grand objective of the Incarnation: "I am come that they may have life, and may have it more abundantly" (John 10:10).

(6) *Ibidem*.

Exemptions from Fasting

Gerald Kelly, S.J.

THE PENITENTIAL season of Lent always brings with it the personal question: what should I do about fasting? Very likely the practical solution to this problem in most religious communities is a regulation to consult one's confessor and abide by his decision. This is certainly a wholesome custom; and it is not the purpose of this article to criticize it in any way. Nevertheless, it seems profitable for the religious themselves to know something of the mind of the Church regarding exemptions from fasting. This knowledge should be particularly helpful to superiors, since there may be times when they must pass judgment on their subjects' obligation to fast. Other religious also can profit by the knowledge, for it sometimes happens that they cannot consult their confessor, at least for several days, and, even when they can consult, they can do so more intelligently and follow advice more reasonably if they are familiar with the principles governing their cases.

This article, therefore, is intended to answer only one question, which may be phrased as follows: In what circumstances is one exempt from the general law of fasting? The only point to be considered is the *obligation to keep the general fasts of the Church*. There is no question here of the obligations of rule concerning fasting as these exist in various religious communities. Nor is there question of the ascetical aspect of fasting. We can take for granted that fasting is a splendid act of penance and mortification, as is evidenced by the entire Catholic tradition in the matter; take for granted also that the keeping of the common fasts of the Church in union with the other members of the Church is highly pleasing to God and of great profit to souls. These are interesting questions, but beside the point of the present article, the whole purpose of which is to determine who, according to the mind of the Church, may omit fasting without violating her law.

The first expression of the Church's mind is found in the *ecclesiastical law itself*. Canon 1254, which contains the fasting law, exempts all who have not completed their twenty-first year and all who have begun their sixtieth year.

Canon 1245 makes provision for other exemptions by granting the power of dispensing to local Ordinaries, pastors, and superiors of exempt clerical orders. Custom, the unwritten law of the Church, exempts all who are engaged in hard and protracted manual labor.

The foregoing are the only reasons for exemption contained explicitly in the law of the Church. They do not, however, exhaust the reasons which the Church acknowledges as valid excuses from the obligation of fasting. By far the greater number of excuses can be found in the teaching of the moral theologians. To put the matter briefly, these theologians, applying a principle approved by the Church as a legitimate method of interpreting the law, teach that fasting is not obligatory when it involves extraordinary difficulty.

The word, *extraordinary*, has a technical meaning which is perhaps best explained by contrasting it with what might be termed *ordinary* difficulty. Evidently, the fasting law is intended to impose on the faithful some inconvenience, that is, the inconvenience of self-denial. An inconvenience of this kind is termed *ordinary*, and it would not excuse anyone from the observance of the fast. On the other hand, in a general law of this nature, the Church does not wish to impose exceptional hardship on anyone; much less does she wish to do harm or to hinder greater good. Such difficulties as these would be termed *extraordinary*, with respect to this law; that is, they are outside the scope of the law, and they excuse the faithful from the obligation of observing it.

Applying this principle of extraordinary inconvenience, moralists teach that the sick and convalescent are excused from the obligation of fasting. Also exempt are those who, though perhaps not technically "sick," are of frail constitution; also *extremely nervous* people. Such persons normally need nourishment frequently; fasting would prove harmful to them.

It sometimes happens that even those in rather normal health cannot fast without severe headaches or dizzy spells; also that the fast will render it impossible for them to get their needed rest at night. Some people are unable to get the one substantial meal allowed to those who fast; some are physically unable to eat or digest such a meal. Finally, there are many who find that fasting interferes with their

necessary work; they lose valuable time and are quite inefficient. *All cases like these are included under the exemption by reason of extraordinary inconvenience.*

One might ask this very practical question: How am I to know if fasting would be exceptionally difficult for me or be harmful to me or my work? Perhaps the simplest way of answering this question is to tell such people to experiment a bit. This is the simplest but not always the most prudent method. Unless the experimentation is carried on very cautiously, it can work harm, and it can do this so quietly that the harmful effects are not perceived until it is too late. To avoid such injurious effects, one may legitimately follow certain recognized presumptions in deciding one's obligations to fast.

The presumption of excuse favors those who are engaged in hard mental labor, for example, teachers and students. Regarding teachers, one may notice an interesting development in the opinions of theologians. The older theologians were quite ready to excuse a professor of the higher branches, even though he had to lecture only one hour a day. They presupposed, of course, that he had to spend the day in preparation and that he did not merely read lectures which had long since been cast into permanent mold. But these theologians were not always so benevolently inclined toward teachers of the lower grades (the equivalent of our high schools and grammar schools), even though these had to spend several hours a day in the classroom. Father Ballerini, an eminent moral theologian of the last century, citing the especially severe opinion of one older school, remarked very tartly: "we should note that these great doctors were always engaged in teaching the higher branches; they had no experience in this humbler art." Also in the case of students there has been a progressive development towards leniency. Today, it is quite safe to say that the presumption of excuse favors those who spend several hours a day in teaching the lower grades, as well as diligent students who spend most of the day either in attending lectures or in preparing their lessons. When I say "the presumption of excuse favors" those mentioned in this paragraph, I mean that these persons may consider that they are not obliged to fast, unless they have very solid grounds for assurance that they can fast without harm to

themselves or their work. Those able to fast while carrying on these works are the exception rather than the rule.

The same presumption favors those who must spend long hours in the confessional or who are engaged in strenuous preaching. It may also be used in favor of those who are engaged in fatiguing works of mercy, such as caring for the sick. It should be noted that in all these cases, it is not only the strain of the work which favors exemption, but also the fact that the works themselves are of great importance. There should be no danger that fasting will interfere with their proper performance.

The foregoing examples of extraordinary inconvenience were chosen because they are of particular interest or practical value to the readers of this magazine. In cases such as these, the Church law does not bind. Furthermore, merely from the point of view of general legislation, there is no strict obligation of consulting anyone, if one can form a prudent judgment of his own case. A community regulation of consulting the confessor or spiritual director should, of course, be followed; and in general it is considered wise for everyone to consult about the matter. Often enough, it is difficult to form a prudent, and especially a quieting, judgment of one's own case.

Mention has already been made of those who have the power of granting a dispensation from fasting; local Ordinaries, pastors, and superiors of clerical exempt orders. These generally delegate the power to other priests, especially at a time like Lent; and the Holy See occasionally delegates other priests by special indults. None of these, even the Bishop, can give a dispensation without some reason; but the reason need not be so serious as would be required for exemption by reason of extraordinary inconvenience. A dispensation is perhaps the best of all means for setting one's mind at rest regarding the obligation of fasting.

Even those religious superiors who have no power to dispense can pass judgment on their subjects' ability to keep the fast, and if they judge that a reason such as those described as extraordinary inconveniences is present, they may tell the subject not to fast. For passing such a judgment, no special jurisdiction is necessary. Certainly superiors are in a position to make a prudent judgment, for they

should know both the capacity of their subjects and the strain or importance of their work.

From what has been written here, it will appear that a fairly large number of religious engaged in the active life are not strictly obliged to keep the general fasts of the Church. They have the same right as others to take advantage of exemptions. Someone might object, of course, that religious have an added obligation to give good example. The objection does not appear to have much weight in the present instance. Religious should, by all means, give example to the world of a spirit of self-denial and mortification, but it is not necessary that this example extend to the letter of the law concerning fasting.

In fact, without attempting in any way to minimize the general importance of the fasting law, one might advance several obvious reasons why religious have less need of this particular austerity than have others. Their life is a well-regulated, well-disciplined one, and those who lead it faithfully are being constantly schooled in self-denial. Furthermore, the very regularity of their life makes them feel more keenly the change brought about by fasting and renders them more apt to be upset by it. Finally, their work itself is of great spiritual importance. As for bad example, the sharp or sarcastic word spoken by the confessor, teacher, or nurse is much more harmful than the so-called "scandal" of religious who do not fast.

Perhaps these few remarks will prove helpful to religious, particularly to those who are inclined to worry about the fasting obligation or to lament the fact that they are judged unable to fast. They should take consolation in the thought that they can practise an even more meritorious self-denial by observance of their rule, by fidelity to duty, and especially by a constant and delicate charity. The inability to fast does not deprive them of the opportunity of glorifying God or of helping souls.

Saint Robert Bellarmine's Sign of the Cross Clement DeMuth, S. J.

CATHOLICS with a greater than average knowledge of their religion are sometimes at a loss when they are called upon to render an account of some simple religious truth. They discover in themselves, not so much a lack of technical knowledge that lends itself to explanation only in learned phrases, but rather a failure to appreciate the mental capacity of the child or other unlettered person to be instructed. To adapt one's knowledge of even the simpler God-given truths to the understanding of such a person is an art that must be cultivated, and developed, and integrated with one's deepening knowledge of human nature itself.

The great catechists in the course of the Church's history practiced this art in signal fashion. One of the greatest of these, if indeed not the very greatest, was St. Robert Bellarmine, Cardinal, Theologian, and Doctor of the Universal Church. In 1597 Pope Clement VIII requested St. Robert to publish his catechetical method which was proving so successful with the unlettered people of Rome. The saint prepared two catechisms, the first of which was a compendium of Christian Doctrine in form suitable for learning by rote. The second, with which we are here particularly concerned, was a kind of teacher's manual and was entitled *An explanation of Christian Doctrine written in the form of a Dialogue, for the use of those who teach it to children and to other simple people*. The success of the little two-fold work, written in Italian, was immediate and, what is more significant, enduring to an extraordinary degree. In the words of St. Robert's biographer, Father Brodrick, "with the exception of the Bible and the Imitation of Christ, it would be difficult to name any other book which went round the world so rapidly and became familiar to so many different races." A series of Roman Pontiffs commended, prescribed, and in general promoted the little work down through the years from the time of Clement VIII until our own century.

With its richness of content, the saint's early chapter on that most obvious—and not always fully appreciated—

prayer, the Sign of the Cross, is representative. Its attentive perusal brings the conviction that "children and other simple people" are not the only ones who may profit by the saintly Doctor's explanation of a simple prayer. The style of composition is informally conversational, with the pupil thoughtfully asking questions which would naturally occur to one listening attentively to the explanation of a rather difficult truth. It may be noted that the teacher makes continual use of examples and illustrations, never permitting himself to forget that the pupil is little used to abstractions. Here is a translation of the chapter on

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS

PUPIL: Please give me a brief account of the more important mysteries contained in the Creed.

TEACHER: There are two principal mysteries of our faith, and both are included in that sign which we call the Sign of the Cross.

The first is the unity and trinity of God.

The second is the Incarnation and Death of the Savior

PUPIL: What is meant by the unity and trinity of God?

TEACHER: These are very deep truths and the explanation of them is a very slow process. For the time being, however, it will be enough to learn just the names, and a very little bit more. The unity of God means that besides all created things there is one thing that had no beginning. It has always been and it will always be. It has made all other things, and it supports them and governs them. It is the highest, noblest, most beautiful, most powerful, the absolute master of every thing; and this being is called God. There is just one God. There can be only one true Divinity, that is, one nature, one essence infinitely powerful, wise, good, and so forth. Nevertheless, this Divinity is found in three persons that are called the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. These three persons are just one God because they have the same Divinity, the same essence. As for example, if three persons here on earth, named Peter, Paul, and John, had the same body and the same soul, they would remain three persons; because one would be Peter, and another Paul, and another John. Nevertheless, there would be just one man, not three men, there not being three bodies and three souls, but just one body and one soul.

Such a state of affairs is not possible among men, because the being of man is little and finite, so it cannot be in many persons. But the being of God, the Divinity of God, is infinite. The same being, the same Divinity is found in the Father, in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit. There are then three persons because one is the Father, the second is the Son, and the third is the Holy Spirit, and there remains nevertheless just one God, because these persons have the same being, the same power, wisdom, goodness, and so forth.

PUPIL: Now tell me what is meant by the Incarnation and Death of the Savior.

TEACHER: The second divine person, whom we have called the Son, besides his divine being, which he had before the world was created, indeed from all eternity,—this second person took for himself a human body and a human soul, that is, our whole human nature, in the womb of a most pure virgin. Thus he who was at first just God now began to be both God and man. After living among men for thirty-three years, during which time he taught the way of salvation and worked many miracles, at last he let himself be crucified, and on the Cross he died to make satisfaction to God for the sins of the whole world. After three days he rose from death to life, and after forty days he ascended into heaven, as we say in the article of the Creed. That is what we mean by the Incarnation and Death of the Savior.

PUPIL: Why are these the principal mysteries of our faith?

TEACHER: Because in the first is contained the first principle and last end of man; in the second we have the unique and most efficacious means of knowing that first principle and of arriving at that last end. And because by our belief in and confession of these two mysteries we are distinguished from all the false sects, from Turks, Jews, and heretics. And finally, because without believing and confessing these two mysteries, no one can be saved.

PUPIL: How are these two mysteries included in the Sign of the Cross?

TEACHER: The Sign of the Cross is made saying: *In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy*

Spirit; at the same time signing oneself in the form of a cross, putting the right hand to the forehead when one says: *In the name of the Father*, and then to the breast when one says: *and of the Son*; finally to the left and right shoulders when one says: *and of the Holy Spirit*. The words, *in the Name*, show the unity of God, because we say name and not names; and by name is meant the power, and the divine authority, which is one in all three persons. The words, *of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, show the trinity of persons. Signing oneself in the form of a cross represents the Passion, and consequently the Incarnation, of the Son of God. Moving the hand from the left to the right, and not from the right to the left, means that by the Passion of our Lord we are transferred from temporal to eternal things, from sin to grace, and from death to life.

(NOTE: It may be well to observe that St. Robert, in illustrating certain spiritual realities by the movement of the hand from left to right, can be said to be exercising his ingenuity. He would no doubt find another interpretation if his catechism were for oriental Catholics, who make the Sign of the Cross moving the hand from right to left!)

PUPIL: What is the effect of making the Sign of the Cross?

TEACHER: First, it shows that we are Christians, that is, soldiers of our High Commander, Christ; because this sign is like a flag, or uniform, which distinguishes the soldiers of Christ from all the enemies of Holy Church; from gentiles, Jews, Turks, and heretics. Further, this sign is made to invoke the divine assistance in all our works. With it we summon the aid of the most Holy Trinity, through the Passion of the Savior. Accordingly good Christians are accustomed to make the Sign of the Cross when they rise from bed, when they leave the house, when they sit at table to eat, when they are about to go to bed, and at the beginning of every action that they have to perform. Finally, this sign is made to arm oneself against every assault of the devil, because the devil is terrified by it, and flees from it, as do criminals when they encounter the sign of the police. Very often by means of this sign of the holy Cross man has escaped many evils, both spiritual and temporal, when he makes it with faith and confidence in the divine mercy and in the merits of Christ, our Lord.

Liturgy in the Pattern of Modern Praying

Gerald Ellard, S.J.

WHEN the history of our times is written, chroniclers will dwell on the fact that they are characterized by three great, world-embracing prayer-movements. They will speak of the widespread initiation of large groups of the laity of both sexes into systematic asceticism, be it that of the *Spiritual Exercises*, or other forms, collectively centering in what is known as the retreat movement. Again, they will point how this age, the world over, has shown a sudden deep concern, practical as well as theoretical, in that communion with God, that apperception of God, known as Catholic mysticism. Lastly historians will take pains to record that twentieth century Catholicism is endeavoring once more to integrate the layman and laywoman into the offices of public worship. Doubtless, too, the portrait-painters of our age will pause a bit to discourse on the mysterious power possessed by this Church twenty centuries young to renew its life and reform its institutions by drawing upon fresh streams of vitality welling strong within her. "So it has been in each great crisis," we can well imagine one of them concluding; "when the forces of the Church seems spent, then it is she finds new power surging up within her: in the twentieth century the Church refreshed herself and the world by refashioning the pattern of her praying." This article concerns itself in elementary fashion with indicating what is to be expected from the restoration to the people in the pews, after many long ages, of their organic contact with the ministry in the sanctuary in the joint performance of divine service.

The better to visualize the goal of this reform in Catholic corporate worship, suppose we ask ourselves why such a thing as the current liturgical movement was simply inevitable, and must have come sooner or later, if the Church were not content to see one of her chief organs wither to full atrophy. The present-day reform of Catholic worship seeks to redress the multiple losses that laymen and laywomen have suffered in the course of time in their

part in our common worship, seeks to lower the wall of separation, which quite literally in many medieval churches to be seen to this day, and figuratively in them all, shuts the laity out from active sharing in what went on within the holy place where the priestly mediator stood at the altar.

It was characteristic of Christian worship from the very outset that it was planned precisely to allow the fullest understanding on the part of all, the fullest sharing in their respective roles by ministry and people in their joint association with Christ, their Priest, their Liturgist. Pagan altars were accessible to the pagan priests alone; the Jewish Temple admitted lay-worshippers to the outer court near to the altar. But with Christians the altar itself stood conspicuous and accessible to every least, last Christian, because in the new priestly race, all had some sharing, priestly or lay, in the perpetuation of Christ's priestly ministry in the covenant of love. St. Paul thanked God that he enjoyed the miraculous gift of speaking God's praises in unknown tongues: "Nevertheless," he said, "in church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, so as to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a 'tongue' " I and my hearers do not understand" (I Corinthians 14:19). Now Catholic worship in the West turned from the primitive Greek to the Latin, when that became the tongue the common man understood best. It then took the liturgy of the Western Church a fairly long period in which to grow and develop, until at Rome under Gregory I, Pope from 590 to 604, it achieved its zenith, the perfect expression of the Latin Christian's corporate worship of almighty God. How regrettable that Gregory lived in an age of indescribable upheaval, which rendered the realization of his ideal in worship impossible in any ecumenical manner! Particular features excepted, the liturgy of the Roman Rite has never since received such a thorough-going reform and readjustment to current life as Gregory gave it then. In one way or another the layman's place in the liturgy has become more circumscribed with every century since Gregory lived.

To illustrate how this has been the case, suppose we imagine a seventh-century man or woman living on as a 'Wandering Christian' through the intervening centuries, and note how such a pilgrim would find lay-participation in worship further impoverished age by age.

In Gregory's day, for all greater occasions, people met at a fixed rendezvous and then marched to church with Cross and banners, prayer and song. At the common type of Mass, what we call high Mass, people and choir of clerics together made, in the language of everyday life, those responses to the celebrant, which, if they are not exactly the structure of the service, are nonetheless so many short, vibrant bonds with the altar. At the entrance of the clergy, in alternation with the choir, there was singing. So, too, did the people come singing to bring their gifts to the altar at the Offering (Offertory). They shared the clergy's ceremonial postures, standing, extending their arms, bowing or kneeling with the ministers, and gave each other the kiss of peace. So did they join in the psalmody, singing at least the *Gloria Patri*, the *Kyrie*, the *Sanctus*, and, when it was later introduced, the *Agnus Dei*. Singing too they came to the altar, the Table of Union, itself the sign, as the Fathers of Trent were to phrase it later, "of that one Body of which He is the Head, and to which He would fain have us as members united by the closest bond of faith, hope and love." The Roman of Gregory's day could in many ways feel himself "concorporate" in his worship with every one sharing that worship with him.

In the following century, had our pilgrim attended Mass in England, France, Germany, not to mention other countries, he would look in vain for the procession to Mass. Save on Christmas, Easter or Pentecost there would be few communicants at Mass, and correspondingly few offerers giving visible expression of the basic concept of the worship of God by sacrifice. Then, too, he would have found himself one of the very few laymen able to follow the stately Latin, and, as we see from conciliar enactments, not all the priests able to translate for him! But our pilgrim would note with a sigh the people's eagerness in singing as far as circumstances allowed. There at least he could still join with them in prayer that sang.

After a second century of wandering, during let us say the pontificate of Nicholas I (858-867), our pilgrim would have noted with growing apprehension how elementary part-singing had already been discovered. "I sadly fear this may in course of time lead to the neglect, or even the corruption, of unison singing, planesong,* alone possible to

*Concerning this spelling, see note at the end of the article.

the congregation as a whole." But he would have hailed with delight the opportunity given him in the appearance of the sequences, to sing simple, homely rhyming lines with lustiness and joy. Could he have foreseen the future, he would have known that after their period of development, and luxuriance, there would follow such decay that with fewest exceptions the sequences were all to be expunged from the Missal. When that happened, there was taken from the layman the last important element of the Mass he could still sing.

And so it goes across the ages. When St. Thomas was writing in the thirteenth century his explanation of the Mass, he takes it for granted that "there are words which the priest begins and the people take up . . . the Creed and the *Gloria*." In St. Thomas' day the people still answered *Et cum spiritu tuo, Amen* and the like.

Shall we follow our weary pilgrim into the fourteenth century? In The Low Countries, England, France, Germany and elsewhere we find him complaining that the new measured music in such rising vogue everywhere was by its very difficulty robbing him of his chance to sing his prayer to God. "Soon all singing in church will be the monopoly of the expert musicians, and to them will be restricted the fulfillment of St. Augustine's words, 'He that sings prays double.' " What was more, the new type of music, by its sensuous character, so said Pope John XXII, was undermining his virility of soul. But Pope John XXII was one of the popes of the so-called Avignon Captivity, and for that reason people considered him unduly influenced by the French court. *His admonitions drew little attention.*

There was a period when the Council of Basle was Catholic and well-inspired, and thither our pilgrim might have looked for reform of long-standing abuses. How he would have been cheered to note the Council's condemnation and abolition (?) of that abuse whereby "low Mass was said in such a low tone that it cannot be heard by those attending." *That abuse seems to have been spreading then in the northern parts of Europe: "If this is not stopped," our pilgrim grimly reflects, "even my few answers at low Mass will soon be made impossible."* But that was at a day when the Church had just healed the great scandal of the Great Western Schism, and papal prestige stood too low to effect far-reaching reforms just then.

In 1518 Cardinal Louis of Aragon went into The Low Countries. Had our pilgrim gone in his train he might have seen the cardinal's secretary write in his journal about the Flemish priests: "They say [Mass] . . . so low that no one hears their voices. They do not permit anyone to make the responses, except the servers, and no one else." That was noted, of course, because it was contrary to Roman practice come down from time beyond memory. But in 1518 Rome was suffering the baleful consequences of Italian Humanism, and suggestions a cardinal might make on little points like letting the people respond at low Mass would fall with little weight. Then, too, when the cardinal's secretary made that entry in his notebook, it was already some months since Martin Luther had appended his theses to the door of the Cathedral of Wittenburg, and thereby set in motion a chain of events that led to the calling of the Council of Trent. "At long last the layman's losses over a period of a thousand years will surely be redressed at this great Council," said our pilgrim as he faced the journey to Trent. Let us see how Trent prescribed for the cure of this pernicious anemia of the layman's worship, only to have the administration of the remedy postponed by yet further troubles.

II

The aging Luther did not see fit to attend the Council, to which he had once so solemnly appealed, and indeed he was in his grave before its sessions were completed. But despite his absence, he was the greatest challenge to the Council, because he had become the symbol of every kind of error, the accuser of every discoverable abuse. Not a few of those abuses were related to public worship, and as our pilgrim could have testified, were associated with the fact that for centuries the layman was being deprived by force of circumstances of an active and intelligent part in divine service. All this, it was then hoped, would be remedied in this great Council.

Of all the Councils, Trent claims a position unique in many ways, one of which was that from the very outset the definition of doctrine and the enactment of reform-decrees went forward simultaneously. From the Second Session (the decree opening the Council being the sole business of the First Session), January 7, 1546, to the Twenty-Fifth

Session, December 4, 1563, the multiple questions touching the reform of Catholic public worship came up again and again. The Council's solicitude was most in evidence in all that referred to holy Mass, because, as the Fathers said, "of all holy things this Sacrifice is the most holy." In resisting the Protestant demands, the Council deemed it "inadvisable that Mass should be celebrated everywhere in the vulgar tongue." Yet on all having the care of souls it laid the obligation, "lest the little ones ask for bread and there be none to break unto them, to explain frequently during the celebration of the Mass, especially on Sundays and festival days, . . . some mystery of this most holy Sacrifice." If Trent similarly rejected the Reformers' petition that the entire Mass be said aloud, it did reaffirm "that some things in the Mass be pronounced in a low tone and others in a louder tone." Masses at which the priest alone communicated were emphatically declared to be valid Masses, yet in crystal-clear language is affirmed the desirability of having all worshippers communicate: "The holy Council wishes indeed that at each Mass the faithful who are present should communicate, not only in spiritual desire, but also by the sacramental partaking of the Eucharist, that thereby they may derive from this most holy Sacrifice a more abundant fruit." With regard to nuns the Council here went further and decreed that they must communicate at least once a month: "Bishops and other superiors of monasteries shall take special care that the nuns . . . confess their sins and receive the most holy Eucharist at least once a month." The reforms of the Missal and the Breviary, begun at the Council, were then handed over to the Holy See for completion. In a hundred minor ways the Council showed its zeal that anything savoring in the least degree of unworthiness be kept from the public worship of the Church.

The thorny problem of having only proper music in the churches was given much more serious consideration than might be judged from the brevity of this enactment: "They [local Ordinaries] shall also banish from the churches those types of music in which, whether by the organ or in the singing, there is mixed up anything unbecoming . . . so that the house of God may be truly a house of prayer." Indeed many a bishop at the Council may have had the painful experience of the force of that saying, that more people were sung into Protestantism than argued into

it. As early as 1523, in his *Form for Mass and Communion*, Luther had touched upon the desirability of German singing: "I would wish among us to have as much as possible in the vernacular what the people sing at Mass." Within a year Luther had contributed no less than twenty hymns of his own composition to his cause, and after *Ein feste Burg* had made its sensational reputation, religious rebels in non-German countries began to sweep people into their conventicles by giving them the chance to sing at divine service. Small wonder that the Fathers of Trent, with all this before their eyes, wished to purge away the corruption that had overlaid the Church's once so popular planesong. This once restored to the *people*, these would be saved the sad choice of active participation in unorthodox worship, or mute and silent worship in the Church of Rome.

Thus our long-suffering pilgrim, attending the sessions of Trent, might have envisaged a veritable second springtime, a return in large measure to the lay-participation of the days of Gregory I. "The northern half of Europe may remain cut off from the unity of Christendom, but in the Latin countries, and in the vast regions of the New World, I shall once again be able to take an active and corporate part in my compulsory attendance at divine worship."

Vigorously the Holy See set its hand to the completion of this work. The restoration of Communion was making sweeping progress. Naturally the revised texts, ordered by the Council, were a primary concern: these began to appear within five years of the Council's close, the Breviary in 1568, the Missal in 1570, the Pontifical in 1596, and the Ritual in 1614. But as early as October 1, 1567, Rome had seen itself forced to condemn some doctrinal errors of Michael du Bay, which meant that the Church was already engaged in a second gigantic struggle, this one destined to last two centuries, a movement we call Jansenism, and which gives in a word the reason why the long-planned reforms of worship suffered yet another long delay.

III

That movements even the most excellent from every point of view have their appointed day, and must wait for its coming, would seem to be the moral of the story we are

tracing. There could be no liturgical reform until Jansenism was dead and gone. Scarcely had that force made its appearance in the Low Countries, when it found such shelter in high places that it could maintain itself, despite repeated condemnations, for almost two hundred years. It infected practically all of Christendom that had not gone into Protestantism. The Bourbon kings of France, its chief defenders, were linked in such close ties of blood and policy with the royal houses of Spain and Portugal, the dependent duchies of Italy and the imperial house of Austria, that this combination of princes, who had the appointment to bishoprics in their hands, made all effective reform from the side of Rome impossible.

What was far worse was that the 'holier than the Church' Jansenist party gradually developed its own baleful and erroneous 'reform' of worship. In direct opposition to the legislation of Trent and the decrees of the Holy See, the dioceses of France, after the model of Paris, began to abandon the Roman Missal and Breviary, Ritual and Pontifical. From 1680 until well into the nineteenth century there were in France alone no less than eighty of these local 'Rites,' and many of them tinged with Jansenist tendencies. To point out, in passing, one very far-reaching consequence of that state of affairs: that St. Francis de Sales gave his Sisterhood, and so indirectly to so many other modern Sisterhoods, the practice of reciting *The Little Office of the Blessed Virgin* for corporate prayer, was because the Divine Office was under censure by French bishops!

In France itself the Jansenists at least kept the Latin language in their multiple liturgies, although they talked continually about turning these into the vernacular. As a Roman reaction against this proposal it became a matter of excommunication to translate any of the liturgical prayers into the vernacular. This prohibition lasted until the time of Leo XIII, and is the reason why our grandfathers and grandmothers did not have pocket-missals, instead of *Ersatz Keys of Heaven*, to use at Mass.

Excommunication or not, princes were found in the Germanies, and in Italy, then mostly under foreign domination, defiant enough and strong enough to get Mass celebrated in many places in the vernacular. Nor was it just a question of what language was to be used: "Jansenism poisoned," it is a French historian we are quoting, "every

source of Catholic piety, and especially the liturgy." The Jansenist attack on Holy Communion is well known. Not so well known are numerous other matters touching public worship that the Church had to condemn even in Italy. Jansenists solemnly decreed that Masses lacked their essence if the worshippers present did not communicate; that the priest, or donor, was unable to direct the application of the fruits of the Mass; that there should be only one altar in a church; that relics or flowers were not to be placed on the altar; that there must be a vernacular liturgy with loud praying, and the like. It is clear that while Jansenism was a living force, entrenched behind thrones, the Holy See saw fit to postpone the worship-reform projected at Trent. "The Church has to defeat her foes," as John Henry Newman used to say, "and then she can divide the spoils." It was not hidden from the Church that there was both deep religious force and wide popular appeal in the liturgical innovations proposed by the Protestants in the sixteenth century and the Jansenists in the seventeenth and eighteenth. But in the threat of widespread apostasy, the Church had first to safeguard her pearl of great price, the orthodox faith, and then, when the danger was past, she was free to carry out the reforms she had herself long planned. Napoleon, with no intention of doing the Church a service, restored to her the liberty of free choice in appointing to bishoprics, and with that the turning of the tide was close at hand.

IV

To be a Catholic is to live in a lofty dwelling which, under the hand of a Divine Architect, is still abuilding. As we go about our daily tasks in the warmth and shelter of the home of the faith, we can witness over the years the growth of the design being silently worked out above us. In this matter of carrying into execution the worship-reforms planned at Trent the first big step was taken by a young French priest, Prosper Guéranger, who had "discovered" the Roman Missal and Breviary and was struck with their superiority over those assigned him by diocesan authorities. Even before Guéranger became a Benedictine, he began crusading for the reintroduction into France of the abandoned books of the Roman Rite. From 1830 to 1840 his campaign was by means of magazine articles, from 1840 to 1851 it took the form of four stately volumes,

Institutions Liturgiques. So cogent were these writings that bishop after bishop silently set aside the local liturgies, and took up once more that prayer "with the Roman heart." This preliminary phase of the work was completed in 1875 when Orléans was the last to suppress its Jansenist local liturgy.

But even some few years before that event, Pius IX had summoned the bishops of the world to meet in the Vatican Council. The place liturgical reforms occupied in his plans is indicated by the Bull of summons: "In this Ecumenical Council all those things are to be accurately examined, weighed and decreed, which in times so troubled as these concern the greater glory of God, the integrity of the faith, the propriety of divine worship," The unfinished business of Trent was thus placed second only to the purity of the faith in the program as planned for the Council. But, alas, for human planning, even on the part of the Holy See! In 1869 Rome was being held for the papacy against the Garibaldi forces by a French garrison, and the sudden outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War led to the garrison's withdrawal. Thereupon the Vatican Council was dispersed, technically recessed, without the Commission on Liturgy (as far as I know) even making a report.

What the Council could not do, the Papacy must not leave longer undone. So thought the aged Pius IX, now the 'Prisoner in the Vatican'. However his efforts only served to bring out that a long and difficult process of textual reconstruction must precede the reintroduction of popular chanting.

Leo XIII, as prelate, had attended the Vatican Council, and after his elevation to the Throne of Peter devoted no little effort on behalf of "the hoped-for betterment of divine worship." While awaiting impatiently for the restored texts of the planesong, he reissued (1884) existing regulations on Church Music. Again, as Jansenism was at last but a memory, Leo removed (1897) all prohibition against the layman's use of liturgical prayer in vernacular translation. Lastly (1902), with a view of restoring "the spectacle of Christian brotherhood and social equality, when men of all conditions, gentle and simple, rich and poor, gather around the holy altar, all sharing alike in the heavenly Banquet," he expressed the purpose, "the chief aim of our efforts must be that the frequent reception of the

Eucharist may be everywhere revived among Catholics." Let us note the steps: active participation by the use of a text, by singing in common, by communicating together.

So at the threshold of the twentieth century Leo sowed the seed. At that time (1902) the future popes known as Pius X, Benedict XV, Pius XI and Pius XII were engaged under Leo respectively as Cardinal-Patriarch of Venice, a Monsignor in the administrative duties of the Vatican, an assistant librarian in the Ambrosian at Milan, and a young priest engaged as copyist in the office of the Congregation for Extraordinary Affairs. Each in turn has entered into the field of Leo's sowing and, while themselves continuing the sowing, each has bid us look forward for great things in the renewal of the Christian spirit drawn from this foremost and indispensable font, the active participation of the people in the Church's public worship.

"Great deeds require time," in Newman's sobering phrase, and no one could reasonably expect that the losses of centuries could be made up overnight. Very shortly before he became pope, Cardinal Pacelli clearly hinted that the great bulk of the work is still ahead of us: "Once the people have discovered that they are to go forward along the royal way of public prayer, . . ." he said. That discovery must be made by religious as well as others. But it would be false to suggest that a good beginning has not been made. A discerning observer, with an eye chiefly on the musical elements, sums up much in one sentence: "We can thank God He has led us so far towards a pure worship where the prayer will sing and the music will pray, where each member of the Mystical Body of Christ will be taken up into the heavenly worship and actively participate in it with heart and mind and voice." The liturgical movement in the United States as elsewhere is engaged in the "endeavor to bring American Catholics to a fuller understanding of the liturgy of the Church and to a more intelligent participation in it," to quote words recently addressed to it by Pope Pius XII. The purpose of it all, in the rebuilding of the world, that same voice phrased with clearness and precision in a letter to the Hierarchy of Mexico a few years back: "It is precisely through liturgical prayer and visible cult that the soul easily rises to God and disposes itself to receive the consolation of the faith . . . It is in the holy worship of the Church that the faithful . . . truly feel them-

selves one heart and one soul, and acquire greater strength." For the unity and the strength needed in our tempestuous times, let us pray:

"O God, who hast appointed that men together worship Thee in and with and through Thine only Son, our Priest; teach us that the pattern of Christian praying must needs embody, as Thy servant Pius said, social praying, to be voiced under the guidance of pastors, in enacting the solemn functions of the liturgy. Through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Liturgist. Amen."

[Note concerning the spelling, *planesong*: This spelling is a departure from the customary *plain-chant*, or *plain-song*. Many who are interested in the liturgy advocate this new spelling because it seems to be a more appropriate translation of the Latin, *cantus planus*. See *The Catholic Choirmaster*, Vol. 27, p. 109.—Ed.]

CONCERNING BOOKS

TO PUBLISHERS: The editors wish publishers to know that they will welcome good books for review in this magazine.

Up to December 23, 1941, we had received the following books that we were unable to review in this first number:

ONE INCH OF SPLENDOR. By Sister Mary Rosalia of Maryknoll. Field Afar Press. New York.

COLORED CATHOLICS IN THE UNITED STATES. By John T. Gilard, S.S.J. Josephite Press. Baltimore.

PROGRESS IN DIVINE UNION. By Raoul Plus, S. J. Frederick Pustet. New York.

THY PEOPLE, MY PEOPLE. By E. J. Edwards, S.V.D. Bruce Publishing Company. Milwaukee.

LITURGICAL WORSHIP. By J. A. Jungmann, S. J. Frederick Pustet. New York.

In the next issue, we shall begin the publication of a list of *Recommended Books for Religious*. We hope that the list will prove of great service to many communities.

Book Reviews

THE MASS. By the Reverend Joseph A. Dunney. Pp. 375. The MacMillan Company, New York, 1941. \$1.25.

Father Dunney's book was first published in 1924. There have been no new editions, but this is the eighth reprinting. The original price was \$2.50; that is now cut in half.

The book is a detailed commentary on each of the parts of the Mass, from the Psalm, *Judica*, to the Last Gospel. It also contains explanations of the vestments, the altar vessels, and the altar. It is directed primarily to high school students; when it first appeared it was hailed as a pioneer text-book in this field. Some early reviewers gave it the highest kind of praise; today we can affirm that it has done much during the intervening years to give thousands of young people a better knowledge of the central act of Catholic worship.

This is recommended reading for religious. However, one can recommend the book as excellent matter for reading and reflection and at the same time admit that it is not the perfect exposition of the Mass. The author digresses too frequently by giving little sermons which, though good in themselves, distract the reader from the main theme. Furthermore, the book would gain by some revision. It is true that the liturgy changes but little, however, there have been some changes. For instance, the author speaks of thirteen Eucharistic Prefaces, whereas in recent years the number has been increased to fifteen, by the addition of the two very beautiful Prefaces of *Christ, the King*, and of the *Sacred Heart*. And, though the liturgy itself changes but slightly, the scientific study of the liturgy has made great progress. The liturgist of today would lay greater stress on the necessity and meaning of self-oblation in the participants in sacrificial worship, and he would be more reserved in regard to a more or less artificial symbolism attached to certain ceremonial acts, for instance, the signification of the periods of silence within the Mass.—G. KELLY, S.J.

A CATHOLIC DICTIONARY. Edited by Donald Attwater. Pp. xvi + 576. The MacMillan Company, New York, 1941. \$1.98.

This book was originally published under the title, *The Catholic Encyclopaedic Dictionary*. It is reissued under this new title because of a conflict in titles.

Naturally, a detailed review of a book of this kind is impossible. Suffice it to say here that it is both scholarly and of great practical value. It contains definitions of and pointed bits of information on all subjects belonging to the vast store of learning treasured by the Catholic Church, also brief notices of each of the saints in the General Calendar of the Church. It is especially helpful regarding information on the Eastern Churches. One appendix contains a bibliography of Catholic books, which, though not complete, is solid and well-arranged. A second appendix contains "Ecclesiastical Titles and Modes of Address." For American readers, there is a slight deficiency

here, as the new modes of address for American archbishops and bishops are not given.

The book ought to be in every religious house; the reduced price makes this a possibility for all save the very poor communities.

—A. C. ELLIS, S.J.

ALL THE DAY LONG. By Daniel Sargent. Pp. x + 259. Longmans, Green & Company, New York, 1941. \$2.50.

Bishop James Anthony Walsh, cofounder of the Catholic Foreign Mission Society, generally known as "Maryknoll," was, says Daniel Sargent, the man who, "more than any other changed the attitude of Catholics in the United States from that of indifference to foreign missions to that of enthusiasm for them." After Bishop Walsh's death in April, 1936, Archbishop McNicholas of Cincinnati declared emphatically: "I do not hesitate to say that Bishop Walsh is the greatest missionary that America has ever given to the Church. His Society has done more to make America mission-minded than all the religious institutes in our country."

Accepting the estimates of Mr. Sargent and Archbishop McNicholas, himself a Dominican, religious will be happy to have had a grand part in the formation and inspiration of the founders and members of Maryknoll. Young James Walsh's first missionary efforts consisted in collecting pennies for a German Jesuit speaking in behalf of Chinese orphans. High school and a term of college were spent with Jesuits in Boston. Dominicans since 1913 have provided Maryknoll with professors of theology, among whom for many years have been the celebrated Fathers Callan and McHugh. The Maryknoll Sisters were canonically erected as Foreign Mission Sisters of St. Dominic.

But a Sulpician, Abbé Hogan, rector of the archdiocesan seminary at Brighton, Mass., more than any other man turned young Walsh's thoughts toward the missions. Abbé Hogan had been ordained in Paris with Théophane Vénard who in 1861 had suffered martyrdom in Indo-China. The Abbé often read to his seminarians the touching letters of Blessed Théophane. The story of the French martyr entered into Walsh's blood. He later published a life of Vénard and named him special patron of Maryknoll.

As a director of the Propagation of the Faith, Father Walsh became convinced that American Catholics would have more interest in foreign missions if they had brothers and sisters working in the field afar. With Father Thomas Frederick Price he often discussed the desirability of a seminary which would train American priests and brothers to serve abroad, though both men were dubious of their own fitness to serve as God's instruments in the foundation. Their doubts were those of humble priests.

The United States was waiting for such leaders. The reader of *All the Day Long* is impressed by the smoothness of the road over which the founders walked, despite their poverty. Archbishops of the United States met in Washington in April, 1911, to discuss, among other things, the proposed seminary. Father Price, the cofounder,

walked for hours outside the council chamber, praying his rosary, hoping and fearing. He learned later that his mission project had been approved straightway with little discussion, after which the archbishops turned to other matters. Rome gave its approval in June. Without any opposition, but with the strong support of the hierarchy, the mission society was launched, and from then on the life of Maryknoll and the life of James Anthony Walsh were fused. Though Bishop Walsh never labored on foreign soil, he toiled "all the day long" to train apostolic men.

Readers of Mr. Sargent's life of Bishop Walsh would probably welcome a more ample biography of the other Maryknoll founder, saintly Father Price, who died in 1919 in Hongkong. A short sketch of his life was published in 1923. Cardinal O'Connell, an intimate friend, asks: "Am I too daring a prophet to venture to hope that some day . . . the name of Father Frederick Price will have a place in the calendar of the saints?" (*Recollections of Seventy Years*, p. 63.)

Religious will find *All the Day Long* useful as an historical account of the origins of the Maryknoll missionaries, men and women; and interesting because replete with names of great American ecclesiastics of the present and recent past.—W. J. MOORE, S. J.

"FEAR NOT, LITTLE FLOCK." By the Reverend George Zimpfer. Pp. xi + 259. The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee. \$2.75.

In advertising this book, the publishers style certain sections of it as "unusually strong and provocative." The adjectives might be extended to practically the entire book. As spiritual reading, the essays it contains are quite unusual.

It is difficult to review this book without the expression of what may be decidedly personal opinion. Its very provocativeness is a constant personal challenge to the reader. Some may hail the book as the great modern spiritual reading book for nuns. This reviewer finds it necessary to qualify his praise in the following manner: The book is recommended to priests entrusted with the spiritual direction of nuns, also to discriminating superiors and mistresses of novices; it does not seem advisable to choose the book for community reading or to recommend it indiscriminately for private spiritual reading.

The book is intended to help nuns to a proper adjustment in regard to various difficulties that are likely to beset their path to perfection. In the last chapter of the book, the author speaks of a "Sister Mary" whose composite portrait is really a summary of most of the defects that he has tried to analyse and correct in the preceding chapters. In the words of the author, taken from various parts of this final chapter, Sister Mary is "normally a nervous worrier, never sure of herself, one who frequently feels the fear that she is habitually careless—just a religious going through the motions and no more; one who has acted as if she thought Jesus intolerant and harsh with human imperfection; one who has considered holiness to be nothing less than the killing or breaking of her God-given personality and womanhood, instead of an intelligent effort to mold that personality after the character and personality of Jesus. When she meditates, she

rehashes something she has read or heard someone else say; she does not think her own thoughts. Somewhere and somehow she had acquired the notion that faith was implicit belief in everything and anything that was told her regarding her religion; that simplicity meant a refusal ever to question the truthfulness or sincerity of anyone; that humility meant that she must demean herself and consider herself 'the most miserable of sinners.' Meditation books seldom told her what obedience was, but told her often how and where and when to obey, and quite naturally she had acquired the idea that the virtue meant smothering her mind as well as her will. To her, self-effacement meant to seek the background on all occasions and deny herself any genuine pleasure. She confused modesty with shyness and purity with sexlessness, and was a bit proud of her ignorance of that 'weak vessel,' her body. Nearly all these ideas she had 'assimilated' either from books or from others. To her, they were theologically certain. When that little imp called her carnal self suggested that there was something wrong with these attitudes, she thought sadly that her will was rebellious and refused to be broken."

If Sister Mary were to read Father Zimpfer's book, she would find all these attitudes analyzed and remedies suggested. She would notice that, in the course of these sometimes lengthy discussions, the author brings out many excellent points. He urges a loving attitude towards God, not one of exaggerated fear; an attempt to live positively by the imitation of Christ, rather than a constant pecking away at personal faults; an intelligent service of God that recognizes the difference between sin and imperfection, between mortal sin and venial sin; a realization that so-called self-effacement may be nothing but a cloak for indecision and even cowardice, that true humility preserves the balance between pride and discouragement, that respect for others' opinions does not mean thorough dependence of mind on them, that the practice of chastity is not the same as ignorance of the physiological and psychological facts that pertain to sex. These are some of the worth-while points developed in the book, and because of them I recommend it to judicious spiritual directors, superiors, and mistresses of novices. On these and other points, the author has, as the publishers say, written with an unusual degree of frankness, but not too frankly.

I withhold recommendation for community reading or indiscriminate private reading because I think that in these circumstances the book might do more harm than good. It is very analytical; it calls for concentrated and critical reading. The concentration could not be achieved in community reading; the average nun is hardly capable of reading it privately with the necessary critical mind. The result, I fear, would be that certain over-emphasized ideas or "comforting" sayings would remain in the mind and would readily do harm.

It is only fair to give some examples of what I mean by these dangers. For instance, in stressing the fact that certain failures to observe rules are not sins, the author states: "In that case, religious would actually be paying a penalty for their choice of the religious

life, for had they remained in the world these demands would not have been made on them" (p. 6). Speaking of mortal sin, he lays great stress on the notion that it is a black rebellion. Wishing to emphasize the notion that ours is a free service of God, he says: "The invitation remains an invitation even after the taking of the vows" (p. 83). Treating of obedience, he informs the nun that she need not always see eye to eye with her superior, that she may retain her own judgment in some cases (p. 113). Regarding convent customs, the nun is to realize that most of them are reasonable interpretations of the Rule, but some of them are misinterpretations (p. 137).

The foregoing are examples of statements that I think might prove harmful if this book is given to all nuns or read to them. Let us briefly examine these points. It is quite true that rules in general do not bind under pain of sin, but the reason for this is not that religious would otherwise be subject to demands that would not have been made on them had they remained in the world. Obligations can be, and at times are, imposed on us that we might have avoided by remaining in the world: we are not at liberty to interpret our duties according to that standard. Again, mortal sin is truly a rebellion; but the overstressing of this idea can easily prove an opiate to the conscience of those who are tempted to commit sins, which, though technically called sins of weakness, are, nevertheless full-fledged mortal sins. As for the invitation to serve God, there is no parallel between those who have not yet taken vows and those who have. Before taking the vows, a girl is free to bind herself or not; she has no moral obligation to do so, except in the rare instance in which she might judge this to be a necessary means of salvation for her. But by her vows she binds herself to God, and she has a serious obligation to try to persevere. At times it may be better for all concerned for the disgruntled religious to leave, but the primary obligation of the disgruntled party is to readjust her attitude and mend her ways. As to the conformity of one's judgment with that of the superior, it is a traditional principle of Catholic asceticism that such conformity is a point of perfection. It is true that the explanation of how this conformity can be achieved is difficult, yet certainly religious would benefit more by an explanation of this point than they will by the simple statement that they need not see eye to eye with superiors in everything they decree. Finally, it may be very true that certain convent customs are misinterpretations of the Rule, and should be abandoned, but who is to judge this distinction? The mediocre and lax could use it as a handle to upturn community life.

In justice to the author, it should be noted that his statements admit of favorable interpretation; yet it is doubtful if even his context would sufficiently remove the danger of unfavorable interpretation to allow for unreserved recommendation. It seems better for spiritual directors and discriminating superiors to read the book, assimilate the excellent ideas it contains, and use these for the benefit of the nuns.—G. KELLY, S.J.

Questions and Answers

NOTE: This department is conducted for the benefit of our readers who seek information. Any question submitted dealing at least indirectly with the subject matter of the REVIEW will be answered in due time. The following questions are among those submitted at the Institute on Canon Law for Religious, held at St. Louis University from June 23 to July 5, 1941. These questions are being used with permission.

1. Is it required for perpetual vows that a religious be withdrawn from teaching for two full months before taking such vows, or is the eight day retreat only required?

There is no such requirement in canon law. An instruction of the S. Congregation of Religious issued November 3, 1921, regarding the second year of novitiate, ordains that if the novices have been sent to another house during the second year in order to be tried in the works of the institute, such novices must return to the novitiate two months before their first profession that they may prepare properly for this great act. Of course, the constitutions or the custom of an individual institute may require the same for perpetual profession.

As to the retreat, canon law leaves it to the constitutions to determine the number of days to be spent before the profession of perpetual vows. The Code specifies the number of days of retreat in two cases only: eight full days of retreat must be made before beginning the novitiate (canon 541) and before the profession of first vows (canon 571, § 3).

2. Where two years of novitiate are required by the constitutions, may a postulant who has been received two and a half months later than the rest of the class be professed with the class? She would then have spent one year and nine months in the novitiate proper.

Generally speaking the answer is: No. If the two years of novitiate are required by the constitutions for the *validity* of the subsequent profession, this period of time may never be shortened. But the constitutions must state explicitly that the second year of novitiate is required for validity, otherwise it is required only for the licit profession of vows. Only the Holy See can grant an indult or dispensation to shorten the second year of novitiate in a *pontifical* congregation, whether the second year be required for validity, or merely for licitness. The Holy See likewise must grant the dispensation to shorten the second year of novitiate in a *diocesan* congregation, if this second year is required for the *validity* of the novitiate. If, however, in a *diocesan* congregation, the second year of novitiate is *not* required by the constitutions for the validity of the subsequent religious profession, the local Ordinary (Bishop) can dispense from it (Code Commission, February 15, 1935). While it is true that the six months of postulancy required by canon law are not required for the validity of the novitiate, still it would be gravely illicit to shorten it by

any considerable length of time. To curtail it by a few days for a good reason would not be wrong.

3. When must a written permit for an emergency operation on a postulant or novice be obtained from their parents?

Canon 89 of the Code tells us that minors, that is, those under twenty-one years of age, are subject to their parents except in those things in which the law exempts them from the authority of their parents. Now the right to follow one's vocation is such an exception. Hence a postulant or novice is no longer subject to the authority of his parents once he has entered religion, since the religious superiors take the place of his parents. It will be prudent, however, if the postulant or novice is still a minor according to civil law, to ask permission of the parents before allowing him to undergo a major operation, especially if the parents were opposed to his entering religion. If the emergency is so great that it will allow of no delay, then the operation should be performed at once without waiting for the parental permission. In such a case the right to life of the postulant or novice is greater than the civil right of the parent over the child.

4. Our rule says: "They shall be obliged only to the Little Office of Our Blessed Lady which they shall daily recite in community." Is the Office to be said privately by sisters who are absent: a) by those whose teaching assignments come at that period? b) by those who are preparing community meals? c) by those who, with permission, leave to finish work that could be completed later, without being absent from the Office?

If the rule has no other specific prescription regarding the recitation of the Little Office than that quoted in this question, then the obligation rests upon the community as a whole, and not upon the individual members. Hence no sister would be obliged to recite the Little Office privately if she were absent from the common recitation of the Little Office. The prescriptions of the Code regarding the recitation of the Office apply only to the recitation of the *Divine Office* or the Canonical Office, as distinguished from the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin. As far as the latter is concerned, it simply orders superiors to see that this exercise of piety, prescribed by the rule, be carried out (canon 595, §1, 20). The Code neither specifies nor increases the obligation of the rule. In fact the Holy See has even forbidden on several occasions that the recitation of the Little Office should be imposed under pain of sin.

To sum up: 1) the obligation of reciting the Little Office rests upon the community and has the force of rule, but does not bind under pain of sin; 2) individuals who are absent from the common recitation of the Little Office are not obliged to recite it privately, unless the constitutions or the rule explicitly oblige them to do so; 3) superiors are bound by the Code to see that the obligation imposed upon the community is carried out; 4) they may excuse individual religious from being present from the common recitation of the Little Office for any reasonable cause.

5. May a professed religious make a private vow? Is this advisable? By whom may one be dispensed from such a vow? Are acts made in conformity with this vow more meritorious than the same acts without the vow?

Generally speaking all persons, including religious, have a right to make a private vow since such an act is an exercise of the virtue of religion and acts made in conformity with such a vow are more meritorious than the same acts without the vow, other things being equal. For religious, however, such private vows are, generally speaking, not advisable for many reasons, and they should not make such vows without first consulting their confessor or spiritual director. They should find comfort in the thought that all their acts are more meritorious by reason of their vow of obedience. Here are the regulations of the Code with regard to the private vows of religious: 1) all private vows taken before religious profession are suspended as long as the subject remains in religion (canon 1315). Such vows, therefore do not bind the religious during the period of the religious life, but the obligation of observing the vow would revive if the religious left his institute and returned to the world: 2) during the postulancy and novitiate, all superiors (even those who are not priests, whether men or women) may suspend the obligation of all private vows for that length of time during which they might interfere with the actual duties of the postulant or novice (canon 1312, § 2); as regards private vows taken after the first religious profession, all superiors, whether men or women, can annul such vows by reason of their dominative power (canon 1312, § 1) even though they approved the taking of the vow: 4) the Ordinary, or any priest delegated by him, can dispense religious from such private vows (canon 1313).

6. Must the confessional in a convent have a white curtain between the priest and the penitent?

Canon 909, § 2 prescribes as follows: "The confessional shall be provided with a fixed grating with small perforations between the penitent and the confessor." (An ancient decree of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars prescribed that the openings in the grate should be so small as not to allow the passage of the little finger.) Hence the common law of the Church does not prescribe a curtain of any kind. However, Bishops have the power to pass local regulations over and above what is prescribed by the Code, and it may well be that in certain places such a curtain is prescribed by diocesan law. Even in the absence of any regulation, there are many advantages in having such a curtain in the confessional, though it need not necessarily be white.

Decisions of The Holy See of Interest to Religious

NOTE: By the term, "Holy See," we mean not only the Holy Father, but also the Sacred Roman Congregations through which he is accustomed to transact the business of the universal Church¹. Our policy in giving these decisions will be to cite first the most recent decisions we have on hand, then in each issue of the REVIEW to add a few less recent decisions until we have completed everything of importance from the year 1936.

1941, July 25. The S. Congregation of Religious and the S. Congregation of Seminaries and Universities issued a joint decree to the following effect: 1) Before admitting to the seminary any person who has belonged to a religious institute under any title whatever, the Ordinary must have recourse to the S. Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, which will inform the Ordinary of its decision after having considered all the circumstances of the case. 2) Likewise, before admitting to a religious institute one who has left a seminary, religious superiors must have recourse to the S. Congregation of Religious, which will inform superiors of its decision after having considered all the circumstances of the case.

Pope Pius XII approved and confirmed this decree and ordered it to be made public.

Henceforth, therefore, religious superiors may not receive into their religious family any one who *has left a seminary*. No distinction is made between one who has left voluntarily and one who has left by request. Since the decree uses the term "has left," it seems that if a seminarian applied for entrance into a religious institute and was accepted by the religious superior *before* he left the seminary, the case would not have to be referred to the S. Congregation of Religious. Canon 542, 2^o requires that a cleric in *major* orders must consult his Ordinary before he can be lawfully admitted to a religious institute; hence it implicitly grants permission to a cleric in minor orders and to a seminarian not yet tonsured to enter religion without any special permission. In practice, therefore, religious superiors may still receive a seminarian who has not yet left the seminary (who has applied and has been accepted before leaving the seminary) without referring the case to the S. Congregation of Religious, unless the Holy See determines otherwise.

1941, July 8. The S. Congregation of Rites discussed the "non-cultus" in the cause of Elizabeth Ann Bayley Seton, Foundress of the Sisters of Charity of Saint Joseph in the United States. Mother Seton's cause of beatification was formally introduced on February 28, 1940. The first step in the process of beatification is to prove

1. An article dealing with these Sacred Roman Congregations will appear in a subsequent number of the REVIEW.

that no acts of public worship have been accorded the person whose cause of beatification has been introduced. This is called the process of "non-cultus." It has been satisfactorily passed upon in the case of Mother Seton. The Commission will now proceed to the inquiry whether Mother Seton practiced heroic virtue.

1941, June 21. Pope Pius XII appointed Cardinal Francis Marchetti-Selvaggiani Protector of the Institute of the Brothers of Saint Francis Xavier.

1941, January 15. At the request of the President of the Italian Radiological Society, Pope Pius XII declared Saint Michael, Archangel, to be the Patron and Protector of Radiologists and Radiotherapists. This new Patron will be a source of inspiration to all religious engaged in radiotherapy.

1940, November 23. Pope Pius XII revoked the faculty which had been granted on December 6, 1928, to all Nuncios and Apostolic Delegates whereby they could grant the faithful permission to transfer from one rite to another. Superiors will recall that they may not receive a candidate into their institute who belongs to an Eastern rite without first obtaining permission of the Holy See. Since December 6, 1928, this permission could be obtained from the Apostolic Delegate, but he can no longer grant such permission to transfer. Hence, in the case of all members of the Eastern Church who wish to join a religious institute of the Latin Church, the permission to receive them will have to be obtained directly from the Holy See.

1940, May 12. Beatification of Venerable Mother Philippine Duchesne, Religious of the Sacred Heart, who labored in Saint Louis and Saint Charles, Missouri, and in the Sugar Creek Mission of the Immaculate Conception among the Pottawatomie Indians in Linn County, Kansas.

1940, May 2. Canonization of St. Mary of St. Euphrasia Pelletier, Foundress of the Congregation of Our Lady of Charity of the Good Shepherd, and of St. Gemma Galgani, Virgin, who died in Lucca, Italy. The feast of St. Euphrasia is set for April 24, that of St. Gemma for April 11. Neither feast has been extended to the universal Church.

1940, April 3. Pope Pius XII extended the feast of St. John Leonardi, Founder of the Congregation of Clerics Regular of the Mother of God, (canonized on April 17, 1938) to the universal Church to be celebrated by all on October 9. The Mass to be said in honor of the Saint may be found in the Missal under the heading "Missae pro aliquibus locis" for the same date.

1939, December 12. The Holy Office forbade the encouragement among the faithful of two new forms of devotion commonly called: "the devotion to the annihilated love of Jesus," and the "Rosary of the Most Sacred Wounds of Our Lord Jesus Christ." Religious above all persons should be extremely careful not to encourage new devotions before they have been approved by the Church. A special decree of the Holy Office forbidding the introduction of new forms of worship or devotion was issued on May 26, 1937, and will be given in this column later on.